00098049

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh
FOUNDATION

An Initiative by
HDFC
WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 28 December, 2018

THE SOCIAL LIFE OF THE GREEKS, II

GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT

323-146 B.C.

GREEK

LIFE AND THOUGHT

FROM THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER TO THE ROMAN CONQUEST

ε3049 a

BY

J. P. MAHAFFY

FELLOW ETC. OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN; HON. FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD; KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF THE REDEEMER; CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ACADEMY OF VIENNA; AUTHOR OF 'PROLEGOMENA TO ANCIENT HISTORY'; 'KANT'S PHILOSOPHY FOR ENGLISH READERS'; 'SOCIAL LIFE IN GREECE FROM HOMER TO MENANDER'; 'THE GREEK WORLD UNDER ROMAN SWAY'; 'RAMBLES AND STUDIES IN GREECE'; 'A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE'; 'THE EMPIRE OF THE PTOLEMIES'; EDITOR OF THE PETRIE PAPYRI, ETC.

SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED AND CONSIDERABLY ENLARGED

NN. i. 27a

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.

1896

All rights reserved

98049

First Edition 1887
Second Edition 1896

AMICO

EDGARDO VINCENT

AMICUS AUCTOR

PREFACE

As the text of the former edition of this book is in the present volume rehandled in many places, and enriched with new materials, the former preface has become antiquated, and is therefore not here reprinted. This volume is the second of the series which I have written on the social life of the Greeks, and its natural sequel is the volume entitled *The Greek World under Roman Sway*. A fourth volume yet remains to be written, which will be devoted to the period of Greek thought and letters from Hadrian to Julian. But even if this work be never accomplished, the other three volumes stand independently as studies of three distinct periods of great importance and interest. The special title of the present volume means to include all the life of Greek-born or Greek-speaking people, wherever they dwelt. I should have called it *Hellenistic* Life and Thought, but that the proper force of this adjective, as distinguished

from Hellenic, requires explanation, and moreover, the book does not exclude later Hellenedom, or strictly Greek society, as distinguished from the Hellenism of foreigners, such as Persians and Jews.

In the second place, as this book was not intended exclusively for scholars, it became necessary to introduce some account of the history and literature of the age as the background for the estimate of life and manners, which is my main object. I might possibly have assumed a knowledge of this history and literature in the scholar, though, even for scholars, the epoch is one of great complication and obscurity, lying outside the bounds of ordinary classical reading; but, in the general reader, this special knowledge could not possibly be expected. Hence there is more actual history in the present volume than in its predecessor, and its limits are marked, not by great authors, but by great political events.

So much I may preface in vindication of the title. Those who desire a compendious review of the events of the period over which we are about to travel will now find it in my *Story of Alexander's Empire* (F. Unwin), where the main facts and dates are set down with some brief hints of the topics expanded in the present volume. At the

same time I have added a chronological table to the present volume.[1]

I am not ashamed to confess that as I had no predecessor on this subject, and was obliged to gather materials from many scattered sources, some evidence of importance had escaped me. It was not likely to happen in those portions of the book where I had the advantage of using Droysen's *History of Hellenism*, or Hertzberg's *History of Greece under the Romans*. But the former of these books stops with the battle of Sellasia and the death of Antigonus Doson, while the latter confines itself to the direct relations of Rome with Greece, and therefore begins far on in the epoch I have chosen, nor does it even then touch on Asiatic or Egyptian Hellenism. Moreover, since the publication of both, a mass of new material in inscriptions and on papyri has come to light. Again, the Jewish reaction had to be sought in a wholly different field of literature—Josephus, 'Aristeas,' Clemens Alexandrinus, and the theological historians who have in recent times studied the Apocrypha. Polybius, of course, is our main source for the latter chapters, and the reader will find him largely quoted from Hultsch's edition.

[1] It must be remembered that many of the dates in this period are disputed, and many not to be accurately determined. Fortunately, approximate dates are sufficient for a study of social life.

But the main alterations in this edition arise from the utilisation of new texts concerning Pergamum, the Fayyum in Egypt, the cities of Greece and Asia Minor recently searched by explorers, and from the suggestions and corrections which have been offered to me by learned men in Germany, in Italy, and in France. The volumes of the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* (*BCH*) and the *Mittheilungen des kaiserlichen deutschen Instituts zu Athen* (*MDI* or *Mitth.*) have afforded me much material, and my study of the later authors for my volume on the Roman period of Greek life (Plutarch, Strabo, Dion) has often given me hints to use in the present book. An ample index has been prepared by my friend, Mr. J. E. Healy. Many minor faults detected by my critics have been corrected.

But there is one larger question wherein many of them differed from me, on which I will here add a few words of justification. For the most careful consideration of their strictures has not persuaded me to change this one distinctive feature in the book—the illustrating of social and political conflicts in Hellenistic days by those which occupy us in the present day. I was told that I was degrading ancient history by these modern parallels, that I was introducing the heat of modern disputes into the calm

atmosphere of classical learning, that I was introducing new controversies into subjects hitherto free from this disturbing element. I will not lay stress upon the fact that the journals which made this complaint were those to whom the historical parallels I had drawn were very inconvenient. The proper ground for me to occupy is far higher. My conception of the Hellenistic world is that of a complex society containing almost all the features of our most modern life. The same problems, the same controversies, the same jealousies, were agitating men's minds then that agitate them now. Is it right or is it wrong for the historian of Hellenism to point out these analogies, and to illustrate the conflicts of that day, by those which the modern reader can appreciate in the world around him? Is it a crime to make what we call the old world revive in the imaginations of men, and assume life and colour, by translating the policy of an Aratus or a Ptolemy into its modern equivalents? Is it worth anybody's while to sit down and endeavour to unravel the tangled skeins of Hellenistic history if he cannot find there a single lesson for life, a single corroboration of the adage that human nature is the same in all places and in all times?

What my critics are therefore invited to do,

is to see that the comparisons here instituted are just, that the analogy really holds; not to complain that such comparisons are out of place, and such analogies disagreeable. An angry politician might very easily strain such parallels; he might convey unjust reflections upon the party he disliked by odious comparisons. This was the error which I sought carefully to avoid, by giving full credit for good motives to both sides, by making full allowance for political mistakes, and by distinguishing them from political crimes. But to banish all this large and fruitful field of illustration from our studies of ancient history would be to play it into the hands of the pedant or of the partisan.

The proper duty of the critic is not thereby to prescribe to the author what method he should adopt, but to weigh carefully his arguments and, in the particular case before us, to test the illustrations and point out where the analogy does not hold. For it need hardly be argued that in societies widely different, not only in date, but in locality and in race, there are many real differences to which due importance must be assigned. The desire of finding likenesses may amount to a passion, and may blind us to the contrasts, which are more than counterbalance them. It is clearly

giving due weight to all these considerations, that an honest and a living sketch of any ancient society can be accomplished.

As far as I am personally concerned, it were indeed late in the day for me to argue the general question. From the beginning of my studies on the great subject of social life in Greece, it was the modern, the essentially human, and therefore universal, features of the Hellenic race which interested me, and which have interested so many readers. The present volume is a corrected, enlarged, improved instalment framed upon the same principles.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,
4th September 1896.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE xvii

INTRODUCTION xxxvii

CHAP.

I. THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF ALEXANDER'S CONQUESTS ON SOCIAL LIFE IN GREECE 1

II. THE REVOLUTION IN HELLENIC LIFE MADE BY ALEXANDER 19

III. THE DIADOCHI AS EXECUTORS OF ALEXANDER'S IDEAS 36

IV. THE YOUNGER GENERATION OF DIADOCHI, AND THE PRINCESSES OF THEIR DAY 55

V. HOME POLITICS DURING THE WARS OF THE DIADOCHI 78

VI. THE RELATION OF ART AND LITERATURE TO THE SOCIAL LIFE OF THE PERIOD 108

VII. THE SERIOUS SIDE OF GREEK SOCIETY — THE RELIGION OF THE DAY 140

VIII. THE GOLDEN AGE OF THE HELLENISTIC WORLD . 162

IX. ALEXANDRIA AND ITS RIVALS 172

X. THE ALEXANDRIA OF PHILADELPHUS; ANTIOCH, ETC. 214

XI. THE LITERATURE OF ALEXANDRIA UNDER THE FIRST AND SECOND PTOLEMIES 239

XII. ALEXANDRIAN LITERATURE—*continued* 280

CHAP. PAGE

XIII. THE CITY LIFE OF THE THIRD CENTURY B.C., AND ITS EFFECTS UPON THE CIVILISATION OF THE AGE 311

XIV. PERGAMUM AND ITS POSITION IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD 331

XV. THE MERCANTILE ASPECTS OF HELLENISM—LEAGUES AND FEDERATIONS—ARBITRATION—PUBLIC CREDIT 355

XVI. THE GREECE OF ARATUS AND HIS LEAGUE . . 381

XVII. THE INNER LIFE OF THE PERIOD 397

XVIII. THE CRISIS OF HELLENISM 420

XIX. THE GRADUAL SUBJECTION OF HELLENISM TO ROME —THE CRISIS IN GREECE AND THE SETTLEMENT OF ASIA MINOR 466

XX. DECAYING HELLENISM IN SYRIA—ITS COLLISION WITH JUDAISM 494

XXI. DECAYING HELLENISM IN EGYPT 532

XXII. POLYBIUS AND HIS AGE 555

XXIII. THE IMPORTATION OF HELLENISM TO ROME . . 597

APPENDICES—

A. *ITHYPHALLUS* ON DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES . . 619

B. *DIOSEMEIA*, 922-954, OF ARATUS (COMPARED WITH VIRGIL *GEORGICS* i. 356-382) 620

C. PROLOGUE TO THE *PHAENOMENA* OF ARATUS . . 622

D. FRAGMENT FROM PHANOCLES ON THE DEATH OF ORPHEUS (COMPARED WITH VIRGIL *GEORGICS* iv. 464-527) 622

E. FRAGMENT OF HERMESIANAX 625

F. FRAGMENT OF THE SIXTH HYMN OF CALLIMACHUS: THE STORY OF ERYSICHTHON 628

G. FRAGMENT OF THE *HECALE* OF CALLIMACHUS . . 629

H. FRAGMENT OF RHIANUS 630

I. ON THE BOUNDARY-DISPUTE BETWEEN SAMOS AND PRIENE 631

INDEX 635

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

DEATH OF ALEXANDER (III) THE GREAT

1ST SETTLEMENT—PERDIKKAS, SELEUCUS, CRATERUS, AND CASANDER TAKE THE HIGHEST OFFICES IN THE REGENCY FOR ALEXANDER'S HEIR, WHILE IN—

	MACEDONIA AND GREECE	SYRIA	EGYPT	ASIA MINOR	THE HELLESPONT AND THRACE
B.C. 323	Antipater.	Laomedon.	Ptolemy.	Antigonus. Eumenes. Asander.	Leonnatus. Lysimachus.
	The far Eastern Provinces are not here considered, because they lie beyond the bounds of Hellenism.				
322	Revolt in Greece. Lamian War, battle of Crannon. Leonnatus killed. Antipater's settlement of Athens. Death of Demosthenes. War against Aetolians.	...	Ptolemy secures the body of Alexander, and resists Perdikkas.	Conquest of Cappadocia by Perdikkas and Eumenes. Flight of Antigonus to Antipater.	[Epicurus comes to Athens. Death of Diogenes the Cynic.]
321	...	...	Death of Perdikkas in Egypt.	Death of Craterus in Cappadocia, fighting against Eumenes.	
	Death of Aristotle. Theophrastus succeeds him as head of the Peripatetic School.				
	2ND SETTLEMENT AT TRIPARADEISUS IN SYRIA.				
	Antipater confirmed and made Regent.	Laomedon confirmed.	Ptolemy confirmed in all African possessions.	Antigonus confirmed and made Commander of the Forces for the Regency. Most of the other satrapies changed, but into obscure hands. Eumenes outlawed.	Lysimachus confirmed.

320	Mission of Demades to Antipater, and his death.	Capture of Palestine by Ptolemy.	...	War of Antigonus against Eumenes. Eumenes besieged in Nora. Alketas defeated in Pisidia. Antigonus master of all Asia Minor.	
319	Death of Antipater—and in consequence new struggle for the office of Regent and the central authority—who makes Polyperchon Regent. Casander flies to Asia. Polyperchon declares all the Greeks free.	...	...	Eumenes in Cilicia, and continued war with Antigonus. Antigonus repudiates Polyperchon.	
318	Death of Phocion. Polyperchon at war in Peloponnesus. Casander recovers power over Athens, and settles it under his commandant, Demetrius Phalereus.	...	...	Naval victories of Antigonus at the Hellespont.	
317	Death of Arridaeus and Eurydice at the hands of Olympias. [Agathocles tyrant of Syracuse.]	...	Ptolemy marries Berenike.	Eumenes flies to the Eastern Provinces, and carries on the war against Antigonus.	
316	Casander master of Macedon. Olympias's death. Decree of Sophocles against the Philosophers.	Antigonus lord of Syria.	Ptolemy settled but threatened in Palestine by Antigonus.	Betrayal and death of Eumenes. Antigonus lord of the East. Flight of Seleucus from Babylon to Ptolemy. Asander still in Caria and Lycia.	Lysimachus established in Thrace and in Mysia, holding the Hellespont.

Coalition of all the other satraps against the dominant power of Antigonus.

B.C.	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	The Hellespont and Thrace
315	Roxane and her son in Casander's power. Antigonus's proclamation against him, and of liberty to all the Greeks. War of Antigonus and Casander's generals in Greece. Rebuilding of Thebes by Casander.	Antigonus conquers Phoenicia and Palestine on his way to attack Egypt.	Ptolemy (and Seleucus) against Antigonus.		
314	Successes of Casander against Polyperchon and the generals of Antigonus.	...	Ptolemy recovers Cyprus. Revolt of Cyrene.	War of Antigonus against the coalition in Asia Minor. Defeat and renewed revolt of Asander.	
313	Continuation of desultory operations in various directions all through the provinces.				
312	...	Demetrius attacks Ptolemy in Palestine, and is defeated at Gaza. Ptolemy sends back Seleucus to Babylon. Victory of Demetrius at Myus in Syria.			
311	The satraps make peace with Antigonus on the basis of the *status quo*, so abandoning Seleucus in Babylon.	...	Ptolemy's decree at Pe-tep.		

	Alexander IV. recognised as king, and Casander his guardian.				
310	Murder of Alexander IV. and Roxane by Casander.	...	Ptolemy's proclamation to enforce the liberty of the Greek cities.		
	[Agathocles in Africa.]				
309	Murder of the bastard Herakles (the last heir of Alexander).	...	Ptolemy threatened by Agathocles from the West.	...	Foundation of Lysimacheia on the Hellespont by Lysimachus.
	The Spartan Cleonymus goes to serve in Magna Graecia.		(?) Ptolemy declared king in Egypt.		
308	...	Foundation of Antigoneia on the Orontes.	Birth of Ptolemy (afterwards king).	Foundation of Antigoneia in the Troad by Antigonus.	
307	Demetrius, son of Antigonus, comes to Athens, and expels Demetrius Phalereus and Casander's forces.				
	The Athenians first revive for him the title of king.	...	...	Demetrius carries on naval wars at Cyprus, and defeats Ptolemy at Salamis.	
306	The satraps assume the title of kings. The idea of the Regency abandoned.	Antigonus's expedition against Egypt and its defeat.			
305	Struggle of Demetrius Pol. and Casander for Greece.	...	Ptolemy assumes the title of king in the Hellenistic world.	Siege of Rhodes by Demetrius.	
303	Re-foundation of Sicyon as Demetrias.				
302	Demetrius again at Athens.	2nd coalition of the other satraps against Antigonus.	Ptolemy invades Syria and Palestine.		

B.C.	Macedonia and Thrace	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	The Hellespont and Thrace
302	Demetrius and Casander still at war in Greece.	...	...	...	Lysimachus invades and conquers Phrygia.
		Conquest of Palestine and Coele-Syria by Ptolemy.	...	Campaign of Antigonus against Lysimachus.	
301	Demetrius and Casander adjourn the war to Asia.	...	...	Great battle of Ipsus, death of Antigonus, leaving Demetrius a fugitive with only naval forces.	
	New division of the provinces of Antigonus, omitting Ptolemy, who had not fought at Ipsus.				
	Casander holds Macedonia and Greece, Lysimachus obtains all Asia Minor, with control of the Greek cities on the coast. Seleucus holds all the East and Syria. Demetrius still holds the sea.				
	Matrimonial alliances between Demetrius and Seleucus on the one hand, Ptolemy and Lysimachus on the other, showing the jealousies arising from the division of the provinces after the decision at Ipsus.				
300	Agathocles of Sicily conquers Corcyra.	...	Pyrrhus of Epirus sent a hostage for Demetrius to Egypt.		
	The Athenians prepare for war against Demetrius, and combine with Casander.				
298	...	...	...	Zipoetes assumes the title of king in Bithynia.	
297	Death of Casander, succeeded by his son Philip IV., who dies the following year.	Samaria destroyed by Demetrius.	...	...	Lysimachus at war with the Getae.

296	Lachares tyrant of Athens. Death of Casander. Antipater and Alexander, brothers of Philip IV., struggle for his crown.	...	Demetrius Phalereus goes to Egypt.		
295	Demetrius Pol. expels Lachares, and again enters Athens in triumph. War of Demetrius in Greece. Pyrrhus king of Epirus.	...	Ptolemy restores Pyrrhus to Epirus.		
294	Demetrius assassinates the young Alexander V. of Macedon.	...	..	Ptolemy recovers Cyprus.	
	Demetrius Poliorcetes King of Macedon. He puts a garrison in Athens and Thebes.	...	...	...	The young Antipater of Macedon flies to Lysimachus.
292	Peace with Lysimachus, who cedes Antipater's rights to Demetrius.	...	...	...	Lysimachus enticed into the steppes and captured by the Getae.
291	Revolt of Thebes from Demetrius. [Death of Menander.]	...	...	...	Lysimachus liberated.
290	Alliance of Agathocles of Syracuse with Demetrius.				
289	War of Demetrius against Pyrrhus and the Aetolians.				

B.C.	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	The Hellespont and Thrace
	[Death of Agathocles, tyrant.]				
288	Demetrius makes peace with Pyrrhus, and begins great preparations for a new conquest of the East.	Coalition of the three powers against Demetrius, who invite Pyrrhus to join them. Demetrius's soldiers desert him when led both against Lysimachus and Pyrrhus.			
287	Demetrius flies from his kingdom, and Phila commits suicide. Olympiodorus proclaims freedom at Athens, but Piraeus is held by Antigonus (Gonatas).	...	...	... Demetrius passes into Asia Minor, which he raises against Lysimachus, whose son, Agathocles, drives him into Cilicia.	Lysimachus divides Macedon with Pyrrhus.
		Demetrius appeals to Seleucus.			
286	Lysimachus defeats and expels Pyrrhus from Macedonia.	Last struggles and capture of Demetrius by Seleucus.	...	...	Lysimachus now master of Macedon, Thrace, and most of Asia Minor.
285	...	...	Ptolemy I surrenders (?) the kingdom to his second son, Ptolemy, known as Philadelphus.	...	He takes Heracleia in Pontus. Ptolemy Keraunus goes to Lysimachus's court.
284	...	Death of Demetrius in Syria.	...	...	Agathocles, the heir apparent, murdered by the plots of Ptolemy Keraunus and Arsinoe.

283	...	Ptolemy Keraunus flies to Seleucus.	Death of Ptolemy I.		
282	...	Seleucus declares war.	...	Seleucus conquers most of Asia Minor.	
281	Seleucus is now master of almost all the empire of Alexander, and proceeds to Macedonia.	...	...	Battle of Korupedion, in which Lysimachus is killed.	
	Murder of Seleucus by Ptolemy Keraunus, who assumes the crown of Macedon.	Antiochus I (Soter) succeeds to the throne.	...	Philetaerus holds Pergamum.	
280	Pyrrhus goes to Italy.	...	Ptolemy II seizes Syria as far as Damascus.	...	The children of Lysimachus murdered by Ptolemy Keraunus at Casandreia.
	Rise of the Achaean League.				
	[Battle of Heracleia in Italy.]				
279	Invasion of the Galatae or Celts, who devastate all Macedonia and Thrace.				
	Keraunus killed in battle.				
	Anarchy.				
	Apollodorus, tyrant of Casandreia.				
278	Defeat of Brennus at Delphi.	...	...	The Galatae in the service of Nicomedes I of Bithynia.	Antigonus defeats the Galatae at Lysimacheia.
	[Pyrrhus goes to Sicily.]			War with Antiochus.	Kingdom of Tylis in Thrace formed.
277	Antigonus in Macedonia as king.	War with Macedon.	...	Settlement of the Galatae in Galatia.	

End of the Forty-five Years' War.
The new era of the Hellenistic kingdoms commences here.

B.C.	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	Rome
276	Aegion joins the Achaean League.				
275	...	...	Eratosthenes born.	...	Pyrrhus returns to Italy from Sicily, and is defeated at Beneventum.
274	...	...	...	...	Pyrrhus returns to Epirus.
273	...	...	Embassy of Ptolemy Philadelphus to Rome.		
272	Death of Pyrrhus at Argos.				
271	Birth of Aratus of Sicyon.	...	...	...	Conquest of Southern Italy by Rome.
270	Death of Epicurus and of Strato.	...	...	...	Silver coinage introduced at Rome.
269	...	...	First mention of the gods Adelphi.	...	Hiero II King of Syracuse.
268	...	...	...	...	Ariminum and Beneventum colonies.
267	Death of Zeno the Stoic.	[Rise of Açoka in India.]	Revolt of Magas of Cyrene.	Ariobarzanes III.	
266	...	First Syrian war.			
265	Chremonidean War.				
264	...	...	...	Nicomedia founded.	First Punic War.
263	Peace of Macedon with Athens.	Peace with Syria and alliance with Cyrene.	...	Accession of Eumenes I at Pergamum. Death of Nicomedes. The Bithynian succession dispute.	Hiero's peace with Rome.
262	Birth of Antigonus Doson.	...	...	Eumenes defeats Antiochus Soter at Sardis.	Gladiators first exhibited.
261	...	Antiochus Theos succeeds.			
260	...	...	...	...	First Roman fleet.

258	...	...	Death of Magas of Cyrene.		
255	...	...	Demetrius the Fair at Cyrene.		
252	Birth of Philopoemen.				
251	Aratus frees Sicyon.	Revolt of Diodotus in Bactria.	Death of Demetrius the Fair in Cyrene.		
250	...	Rise of Arsaces and the Parthian kingdom.	...	Ziaêlas's accession.	Expedition of Regulus.
249	...	...	...	...	Defeated and taken by Xanthippus.
247	...	Murder of Queen Berenike by Laodike. Ptolemy III invades Syria.	Ptolemy III's accession and marriage.	Conquests of Ptolemy III.	Hamilcar Barca, Carthaginian general. Birth of Hannibal.
246	...	Seleucus II's (Callinicus) accession.	His expedition to Asia.	Rhodes and the Greek cities at war with Egypt.	
245	Defeat of Antigonus Gonatas by the Egyptians at Andros. Aratus Commander of the League.	Letter of Seleucus to the Senate at Rome.	Appoints Xanthippus to satrapy of Mesopotamia.	...	The Senate answer Seleucus in Greek, demanding freedom for Ilion, 'the cradle of their race.'
244	Agis IV King of Sparta.				
243	Aratus liberates Corinth.				
241	Death of Agis IV.	...	...	Accession of Attalus I at Pergamum.	Victory of Catulus, and close of the first Punic war.
240	...	...	Eratosthenes called from Athens to the Library.	Attalus's victory over the Galatae. Mithradates IV King of Pontus.	Livius begins to exhibit plays.
239	Death of Antigonus Gonatas. Demetrius II succeeds.	Peace with Egypt.	...	...	Birth of Ennius. Intervention of Romans for Acarnania with the Aetolians.
238	...	War of Seleucus II in the East.	The decree of Canopus.	...	Hamilcar goes to Spain.

	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	Rome
B.C.					
237	...	War of Seleucus with his brother Antiochus Hierax.	...	Antiochus Hierax in Asia Minor.	
235	...	...	...	...	Temple of Janus shut.
233	Lydiades surrenders his tyranny, and Megalopolis joins the League.				Naevius exhibits plays.
232	Illyrian raids.				
231	Apollodorus Carystius, the comic poet, flourishing at Athens.	...	Machon, the comic poet, flourishing at Alexandria.		
230	Illyrian raids.	...	...	...	War with Queen Teuta of Illyria.
229	Death of Demetrius II. Accession of Antigonus Doson. Various Greek tyrants resign.	...	...	...	Death of Hamilcar, Hasdrubal succeeds. First diplomatic relations with Greece (Acarnania).
228	Teuta submits to the Romans. Postumius winters in Illyria.	...	...	Prusias's accession n Bithynia.	
227	The Romans admitted to Hellenic games and feasts. Cleomenes III King of Sparta.				
226	Death of Lydiades. Cleomenes's *coup d'état.*	Seleucus II killed, Seleucus III Keraunus, also called Soter, succeeds.	...	Earthquake at Rhodes.	

225	Cleomenic war preparing.	...	...	...	Gallic war.
223	Aratus's treaty with Antigonus Doson.	...	...	Achaeus satrap of Asia Minor (for Seleucus).	
222	...	Antiochus III's accession.			
221	Battle of Sellasia. Death of Antigonus Doson.	...	Death of Ptolemy III, and Ptolemy IV's accession.	...	Hannibal succeeds Hasdrubal in Spain.
220	Philip V.'s accession. Social war in Greece.	War in Coele-Syria.	...	Attalus besieged by Achaeus. War of Rhodes with Byzantium. Ariarathes IV's accession.	
219	...	...	...	...	Demetrius of Pharos conquered by Rome.
218	Philip sacks Thermus.	War with Egypt.	War with Syria.	Attalus at war with the Greek cities of Aeolis.	Outbreak of second Punic war. Battle of Trebia.
217	Peace made in Greece and Macedonia.	Battle of Raphia.	...	...	Battle of Thrasimene.
216	...	...	...	Treaty of Antiochus the Great and Attalus.	Battle of Cannae.
215	Treaty of Philip and Hannibal.				
214	Philip in Illyria.	...	...	Achaeus captured by Antiochus at Sardis.	
213	Death of Aratus.				
212	...	...	...	...	Capture of Tarentum by Hannibal. Fall of Syracuse.
211	Laevinus at the Aetolian Parliament.	...	...	...	Fall of Capua.
210	War of Romans and Aetolians against Philip. Machanidas, tyrant of Sparta.	...	...	...	First Macedonian war.

B.C.	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	Rome
209	Philopoemen hipparch of the Achaean League.				
208	...	...	...	...	Marcellus the consul slain.
207	Philopoemen Commander of the League. Death of Chrysippus the Stoic. Machanidas slain.	...	...	...	Defeat of Hasdrubal at the Metaurus.
206	...	...	...	...	Scipio's visit to Syphax in Africa.
205	Peace of Aetolians with Philip. Nabis tyrant of Sparta.	...	Death of Ptolemy IV. Ptolemy V's (Epiphanes) accession.		
204	...	...	...	...	End of Macedonian war. Treaty with Philip.
203	Treaty of Philip with Antiochus III to plunder Egypt.	Treaty with Philip.	...	Rhodians and Attalus support Egypt against Philip.	
202	...	...	...	...	Battle of Zama.
201	Quarrel of Philip with Athens. Philopoemen again Commander.	...	...	...	Peace with Carthage.
200	Capture of Abydos by Philip. War with Rome.	...	Mission to Rome. Aristophanes the critic now at Alexandria.	Attalus visits Athens.	Second Macedonian war.
199	Philopoemen leaves for Crete.	...	...	The historians Zeno and Antisthenes at Rhodes.	

198	...	...	Antiochus defeats Scopas at Panion, and conquers Coele-Syria.	...	Flamininus consul.
197	Defeat of Philip at Cynoscephalae, and peace.	...	...	Death of Attalus I. Eumenes II succeeds at Pergamum.	
196	Declaration of freedom of the Greeks at the Isthmian games.	...	Scopas put to death.	...	Wars against Insubres and Boii.
195	Campaign against Nabis.	Hannibal arrives at Ephesus.			
194	The three fortresses evacuated. Flamininus's departure.	Antiochus makes conquests in Thrace.	Eratosthenes dies.	...	Public games (Megalesia) first celebrated at Rome, with reserved seats for senators.
193	...	Roman ultimatum.	Ptolemy marries the Syrian Cleopatra.		
192	Philopoemen Commander.	...	...	Ariarathes IV marries Antiochis, daughter of Antiochus III.	
	Antiochus invited to Greece by the Aetolians.	Expedition of Antiochus to Greece.			
191	...	He winters in Chalcis. Defeated at Thermopylae.	...	Naval operations of Rhodes, etc., against Antiochus and Hannibal.	Glabrio and Cato commanding against Antiochus in Greece.
190	...	Battle of Magnesia.	...	Pharnaces King of Pontus.	
189	Aetolians subdued by Rome.	Peace with Rome.	...	Rhodes and Pergamum rewarded by Rome.	Antiochus (Epiphanes) hostage at Rome.
	The Achaean League reaches its greatest extension.	...	...	Campaign of C. Manlius Vulso through Asia Minor.	
188	Discontent at Sparta, and Philopoemen's conquest of it.	...	...	...	Ligurian wars in process.

B.C.	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	Rome
187	...	Antiochus III dies. Seleucus Philopator's accession.	Alliance with Achaeans.	...	Flaminian way begun.
186	Interference of Romans with the Achaean League.	...	...	...	Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus. Complaints against Philip brought to Rome.
185	...	...	...	...	Complaints of Sparta against the Achaean League.
184	Philip humiliated by Rome. Death of Philopoemen.	...	...	...	Discussions of Achaeans, Spartans, etc., before the Senate. [Death of Plautus.] The Senate declares for non-interference.
183	Conquest of Messene by the League. Peace with Sparta.	...	...	Sinope conquered by Pharnaces.	Mission of T. Flamininus to Greece and the East.
182	...	..	...	Death of Hannibal. War among the Asiatic dynasts. Prusias II's accession.	
181	Apparent peace and contentment in Peloponnesus.	...	Ptolemy V dies. Ptolemy VII's (Philometor) accession.	Mission of Eumenes II to Rome. Missions of Ariarathes and Pharnaces to Rome.	
180	Rome insists on the restoration of the Spartan exiles.	...	...	...	Mission of Callicrates, Aratus, and Lydiades (the younger).
179	Callicrates Commander. Death of Philip V. Perseus's accession.	...	...	Peace and treaty between Eumenes, Prusias, and Ariarathes, as against Pharnaces and Mithradates.	Istrian wars.

177	...	...	...	...	Gradual interference with Rhodes.
175	Eumenes's statues razed.	Seleucus Philopator dies. Antiochus IV's (Epiphanes) accession.	...	...	End of the Ligurian wars.
174	Perseus's demonstration at Delphi, and mission to Carthage.	He sends splendid gifts to Greece.	Death of Cleopatra I.	Artaxias of Armenia conquered by Antiochus IV.	
173	...	...	Marriage of Ptolemy VII to his sister Cleopatra II.	...	Roman missions to northern Greece.
172	Diplomatic preparation for Macedonian war. Intrigues of Charops in Epirus.	...	...	Eumenes II. goes to complain at Rome. On his way home he is all but murdered at Delphi.	Roman troops sent to Apollonia. Third Macedonian war.
171	Successes of Perseus.	...	Antiochus IV invades Egypt.	...	Defeat of Licinius Crassus by Perseus.
170	Fruitless campaign of Mancinus.	Second expedition to Memphis.	War with Syria.		
169	Quintus Marcius crosses Mount Olympus without result.	Third year's campaign in Egypt.	do. Joint reign of the two Ptolemies.	...	Death of Ennius.
168	Battle of Pydna (June 22).	Fourth year's campaign. Antiochus plunders and profanes the temple of Jerusalem.	do. The war stopped by the circle of Popilius Laenas, and Alexandria saved by Roman interference.	...	M. Aem. Paullus, consul.
167	Macedonia divided into separate republics. Epirus depopulated.	...	...	Eumenes humiliated by Rome. Rhodes commercially ruined.	Triumph of Paullus. Dramatic show of Anicius the praetor. Polybius at Rome.
166	Mission from Athens to Rome.	The Achaeans deported to Italy.	...	...	*Andria* of Terence performed.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

B.C.	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	Rome
165	...	Antiochus IV killed in Upper Asia.	...	Rhodian citizens executed and extradited for anti-Roman policy.	
164	...	Antiochus V (Eupator) succeeds Epiphanes.	...	Treaty and peace with Rome.	The Achaeans appeal at Rome. Commission sent to Macedonia to restore order. Terence's *Hecyra*.
163	...	...	Ptolemy Physcon settled at Cyrene. Both the Ptolemies go to Rome to appeal.	Ariarathes V's accession.	
162	...	Demetrius Soter escapes from Rome, succeeds Eupator.	...	...	Terence's *Heautontim.*
161	...	Murder of the Roman envoy Octavius at Syrian Laodicea.	...	...	Terence's *Eunuchus* and *Phormio*. Edict against philosophers and rhetors at Rome.
160	...	...	...	...	Renewed appeal of Achaeans. Death of Aemilius Paullus.
159	...	...	...	Attalus II succeeds Eumenes.	Terence's *Adelphi*. Crates at Rome. Death of Terence.
158	...	...	...	Ariarathes expelled by Demetrius Soter from Cappadocia, in favour of Orophernes.	
157	Death of Charops.	...	...	Ariarathes appeals at Rome against Orophernes, and is restored with the help of Attalus II.	

156	Raid of Athens upon Oropus.	...	Aristarchus now famous.	Mithradates Euergetes's accession in Pontus.	Dalmatian war.
155	The Achaeans again appeal for the liberation of the hostages.	...	...	War of Attalus II with Prusias. ...	Mission to coerce Prusias and protect Attalus. Carneades, Diogenes, and Critolaus sent on an embassy by Athens to Rome.
154	...	...	Ptolemy Physcon again at Rome to appeal against his brother.	..	Pacuvius and Attius now producing tragedies.
153	The Rhodians appeal for help to the League, and are refused.	...	...	War between Rhodes and Crete.	Celtiberian war begins.
150	The exiles return from Italy.	Alexander Bala's accession.	The Egyptian Cleopatra married to Bala.		
149	Diaeus Commander of the League. War of Achaeans with Sparta. Insurrection of the pretender Philip in Macedonia.	...	...	Nicomedes Epiphanes's accession in Bithynia.	Death of Cato. Spartans appeal to Rome against the Achaean League. Quintus Metellus sent against the Macedonian pretender.
148	...	...	...	...	Rupture with Carthage (third Punic war). Scipio Aemilianus and Polybius go to Africa. Birth of Lucilius. Mission of L. Aur. Orestes to Greece.
147	Diaeus again Commander. A new pretender in Macedonia.	...	...	...	Mission of S. Julius Caesar to Greece, and new policy.

	Macedonia and Greece	Syria and Babylon	Egypt	Asia Minor and the Islands	Rome
B.C. 146	Critolaus Commander. Meeting of the League at Corinth. War declared. Metellus conquers at Scarpheia in Locris. Mummius arrives, defeats the Achaeans and destroys Corinth.	Demetrius Nicator's accession.	Death of Ptolemy VII (in Syria). Ptolemy IX (Physcon) succeeds.	...	Macedonia to be made a province. Destruction of Carthage. Viriathus in Spain.
	Rome paramount in the Hellenistic world.				

INTRODUCTION

ANY one who comes to study the Hellenic Renaissance in England, which has assumed such force and such extension in our own day, cannot but be surprised at the abrupt way in which all its studies stop about midway in Greek History. By a sort of tacit consent the battle of Chaeronea is considered the minor limit of all that was good and perfect in Greek thought and life. The conquests of Alexander, the high culture of Rhodes and Alexandria, the profound thinking of the later schools, the deep learning, the splendid art, the multiform politics of Hellenism—all this is shut out from the schoolboy, as forming no part of the Greek he is to know, and it is but seldom taken up—with the exception of Theocritus—by those who preserve the habits and prejudices of school in their college life. A man may consider himself, and be considered by the classical English public, an adequate and even distinguished Greek

Professor, who has never read Strabo, Diodorus, or Polybius, who has never seen the poems of Aratus, Callimachus, or Apollonius, and who does not know a single date in Greek history between the death of Alexander and the battle of Cynoscephalae. From that time onward the accident that Greece enters into the field of Roman history lifts the veil, and the student comes upon a Hellenistic world, so different from the old Hellenic republics, that but for the permanence of names and places the people might be difficult to recognise. After the conquest of Greece by Mummius, Greece as a living moment in the world's history is forgotten. Pharsalia, Philippi, and Actium might as well have been in Asia or in Spain, and the literary activity of the Greeks under the empire is rather avoided than neglected by modern Hellenists. For there is a notion abroad among many scholars that the study of any but the golden age of Greek literature is a contamination of their spotless Atticism. The occurrence of later forms, or of constructions unused by Aristophanes, is so foul a stain, that not the infinite richness of story in Polybius, or the splendid morals in Plutarch, or the large information in Strabo, or the wit in Lucian, or the unconscious sublimity in the Gospels, can save them from being rejected as

'bad Greek,' and excluded from school and college studies.

This is no doubt the first and most efficient cause of our general ignorance of what is called *Hellenism*, as opposed to *Hellenedom*. The golden age in literary style ended with Demosthenes, and though this was by no means the case in philosophy and art, the question of style has overridden larger and higher considerations. No better Greek study than Plutarch's *Lives* could possibly be appointed for boys—with one exception, that of style; and so the intricacies of Demosthenes, the subtleties of Plato, or the contortions of Thucydides are the Greek prose set before them. Great results are indeed required to justify this strict exclusiveness.

A curious accident has, however, aided the 'pure scholars,' and made their triumph in our generation almost complete. Our greatest Greek historian, Grote, was not at all one of their number. His perception of the exact meaning of tenses or particles was such as to excite the rage and contempt of their now forgotten coryphaeus. But Grote was a radical and a democrat, and composed his great political pamphlet in twelve volumes to show the splendours of republican government. Hence he could only traduce Alexander the Great, and turn with indignant

disgust from the later politics of the petty states of Greece. He had no heart to comprehend the splendour of monarchy, or the wisdom of federations. But his great book dominated our studies, the smaller handbooks have abridged Grote and not Thirlwall, and wind up the history of Greece with the close, not of its philosophical and artistic, but of its political and literary supremacy, overlooking the fact that the apparent political death of Greece meant only its absorption into larger systems, and its entry into the wider stream of the world's history.

It is not my object to dispute for one moment the selection thus made on the ground of literary excellence. If a boundary line is to be drawn anywhere, there can be no doubt that it is rightly drawn at the accession of Alexander. His mighty conquests, the unlocking of the treasures of the East, and the generation of wars under the first Diadochi, established so great a gulf between earlier Hellenedom and later Hellenism, that when settled life was again resumed in Greece all feeling of contact with the Demosthenic age was gone, and Alexander was regarded as the starting-point of modern history. No historical claim anterior to the division of his empire was ever again urged as serious; no literary

work was cited earlier than the historians of his day. Thus Polybius, who cites at every turn Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus, refers but once to Xenophon, once to Thucydides, twice to Herodotus.[1]

There are other such periods in history, when half a century makes more change than ages that went before or that follow after. It is established beyond contradiction that the literary and artistic excellence of Greece before Alexander was never again attained by any nation or any age. But while this may be good reason for our decided preference, it is not so for the complete neglect of what the Greeks afterwards achieved. Mr. Freeman has shown, in his masterly history of the later Greek federations, how one of the most fruitful ideas of modern politics was then first adopted. The Apollo Belvedere, the Laocoon, the Dying Gaul, and the Venus of Melos fortunately inspired modern artists and critics before they were discovered to belong to the so-called days of Greek decadence. But these and the great sarcophagus of Sidon show that the silver days of Greek art were more splendid than the gold of other nations. Above all it should be insisted upon that the greatest inheritance the Greeks left in practical

[1] There is no reason to think that if we possessed the whole of his history, the proportion would be altered.

philosophy was not the splendour of Plato, or the vast erudition of Aristotle, but the systems of Zeno and Epicurus, and the scepticism of Pyrrho. In the Roman Empire Platonists and Aristotelians were scarce; Stoics and Epicureans occupied all society. And if in the Middle Ages the schoolmen returned to the great classical masters, in our own day the world has again fallen into modern paths, and every thinking man is either a Stoic, an Epicurean, or a Sceptic. These eternal systems were born not in the golden but in the silver age of Greek literature.

Surely these are ample claims for our consideration.

CHAPTER I

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF ALEXANDER'S CONQUESTS ON SOCIAL LIFE IN GREECE

It is truly wonderful how the literary study of Greek eloquence has blinded modern Hellenists to the general condition of the Greeks after the accession of Alexander. Ask any classical scholar what were the prominent events of the year 330 B.C., and the chances are a thousand to one he will tell you of the great trial of policy and eloquence between Aeschines and Demosthenes. If he be learned in Greek literature, he will be proud to add that this was the year of the prosecution of Leocrates by Lycurgus, as can be inferred from this orator's sole extant oration. Yet all these magnificent harangues were occupied in impeaching or defending the conduct and policy of eight years before, or even earlier. They discuss what ought, or what ought not, to have been done before or after Chaeronea, and what might, or might not, have happened, had the other side won, or had something happened which did not happen.

But the oratorical splendours of the contest, and even the moral splendours exhibited by the once patriotic side, could not have blinded any intelligent man of the rising generation to the fact that all this pother about a bygone policy was

but magnificent fooling. What matter whether a golden crown was voted to Demosthenes rightly or not? what matter whether a broken-down politician had been honest or not? The world had moved on a century in these eight years. Every political problem then of interest had gone into the lumber-room of antiquarian curiosities. The news was abroad that Darius was dead, and Alexander not only conqueror but heir to the orphan empire of the great king. Nay, he had even reached beyond the very bounds of fable —the Amazons, the Pigmies, and the mountains of gold. Eye-witnesses were coming home who had seen the sack of Susa and of Persepolis, where gold and jewels were found enough to buy the whole of Greece ten times over. How senseless to stand out against these facts!

The sudden death of Alexander might, indeed, bring his empire into confusion, and so give occasion for a revolt and an assertion of liberty in the petty cantons and decaying towns of Greece. But the smallest fraction of this Eastern wealth, controlled by Macedonian vigour and military skill, must be more than a match for even Spartan valour. It was indeed true that all the spoil now fell not to Greeks but to Macedonians, whom Demosthenes had asserted he would not buy for decent slaves.[1] But they had now proved themselves complete masters not merely of Demosthenes but of all the world. The time was come to forget that this people were once thought barbarian outsiders to Hellenic culture, and to furbish up the despised genealogies by which their kings sought to prove their descent from Aeacus. The Macedonians too on their part, at least the better among them, were anxious to make up the quarrel and pose as Greeks in language and culture. It was harder to persuade the ruder soldiery, who felt the difference most

[1] Demosthenes *in Philipp.* 119, 8.

thoroughly, and no doubt retorted Demosthenes's indecent sneer with far better reason. But in spite of this jealousy towards those who came in for the wages of Hellenedom at the eleventh hour of the day, there was endless wealth of plunder, endless scope for lucrative employment in the East; an immense civil service was required, with endless possibilities of new trade and commerce, even if the demand for highly-paid mercenaries should ever fail.

An amalgamation therefore of Greek and Macedonian interests was the policy which every true and reasonable patriot should have adopted. There was sure to be an immense emigration of young and adventurous men to seek their fortunes in the East. Were they to go as exiles, deserting their country to serve an enemy, or as citizens of a great Graeco-Macedonian kingdom, all of whose subjects had its glory at heart, and regarded its profits as their legitimate reward?

There could be only one reasonable answer, and that was the answer not given by the leading states of Greece. Thebes had been destroyed. The natural leaders of opinion were Athens and Sparta. The Athenians, when they dared not revolt, sulked and sneered. The Spartans stood aloof in sullen disgust, and then took up arms against Antipater, Alexander's Lord Lieutenant for Greece. Well might Alexander exclaim when he heard of their defeat: 'Macedonians, while we were conquering Darius out here there seems to have been some battle of mice in Arcadia!'[1]

Such parochial politics might fairly be expected from Sparta where five ignorant old men were appointed to watch the close adherence of the state to the system of a fabulous

[1] Plut. *Agesilaus* 15 ἔοικεν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ὅτε Δαρεῖον ἡμεῖς ἐνικῶμεν ἐνταῦθα, ἐκεῖ τις ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ γεγονέναι μυομαχία.

legislator, whose great title to fame was his success in bygone centuries. But it is not adequately felt how terribly Greek interests suffered from a similar course at Athens. If the laws were not obsolete, the politicians were. It is one of the most signal instances in history of the vast mischief done by the government of old men. All the leading patriots, nay, all the leading politicians, were past their prime. There was not a single young man of ability taking part in public affairs; Leosthenes was only a soldier. Even Phocion, who had sensible views, was far too old to see beyond the boundaries of Greece. If any young orator ventured to preach the coming creed, the old masters, who had the ear of the assembly, were out upon him as a hireling and a traitor. There was no alternative but to give up politics altogether, and either to retire from the agora into private life, or to abandon Greece and make a home in the East at the risk of being branded as a traitor. Though a vast number went, many were kept at home by want of energy, by family ties, by that fear of a new departure which dominates the majority in almost every age. These must be content to live as farmers or small traders, or upon the fixed income produced by their property. The sudden growth and importance of the philosophic schools in this and the next generation, prove that thoughtful and original men who stayed at home sought in scientific ethics occupation for the loss of public life, and consolation for the misconstruction put upon their retirement by the noisy patriots.

All these remaining classes were moreover obliged to find some mental equipment against the invasion of an artificial poverty. For at last great fortunes began to be common in Greece. Men came back from Persia and India with that desire to revisit the old country which no foreign happiness can extinguish; also no doubt to display

their new wealth, and live as great men where they had once been small. So the rapid depreciation of money, owing to the liberated millions of Persian treasure—the hoarding of ages—caused an equally rapid increase of prices, while only the returned emigrants or Macedonian officials had acquired an increase of wealth. These economic phenomena become clearer in the succeeding generation, and will occupy us in due time.

But the beginning of everything which we have to record about the Hellenistic age is already laid. The battle of Issus may be regarded as the perfectly decisive event when Hellenedom was buried and Hellenism weaned. The anxious patriots of Athens, hoping not without hope, eagerly watched events as the news came that Alexander was caught in the mountains and defiles of Cilicia, that his communications with Greece were cut off, and Darius with an immense army was in his rear.[1] But they required no reasonable hopes to feed them. They had lived forty years in a political party, and we could hardly expect any political conversion after such training.

We must therefore judge the party of Demosthenes kindly, as we judge all the other old men who have done mischief in the world. We may attribute to them the highest motives, we may long that they had been successful in proper time. But all this respect cannot save us from the reflection that it would have been better for Greece if Philip after Chaeronea, or even Alexander after the ruin of Thebes, had insisted upon the execution of 'the orators,' and pacified Greece not only in outward act but in inward spirit. For it is hard to overestimate the influence of such orators as Demosthenes or Hypereides, working upon old

[1] Aeschines *in Ctes.* p. 552; Josephus *Antiqq.* xi. 7, 3 confirms the existence of this feeling.

prejudices, ingrained vanity, and provincial pride. All the lesser states in Greece seem to follow in the wake of Athens and Sparta, and favour an anti-Macedonian spirit publicly; while thousands of their citizens were growing rich and great in the service of the Empire.

But we are quite accustomed in our own day to outpourings of this Separatist spirit, while the very complainants are profiting signally by the greatness and the resources of the empire which they revile and profess to hate. These modern instances also show us how this policy may be kept up and grow even where every effort is being made to remove all complaint, and where no one can see that the liberty loudly demanded differs sensibly from the liberties already conceded by the sovereign state. If we had no living examples of this feeling before us, we should certainly have said that the ineffaceable passion for autonomy, which marks every epoch of Greek history, and every canton within its limits, must have arisen from the excesses committed by the officers of foreign potentates, or by local tyrants. The tyrant of old, Herodotus had said, upsets the laws of cities, violates women and boys, and slays men without trial. Such also were but too many of the later tyrants. But the outrageous prints circulated in Ireland in our own day show that a ruler[1] may be the soberest, the most conscientious, the most considerate, and yet have terrible things said of him by mere political malcontents. In fact the tirades against the person of the ruler show that there is no serious fault to be found with the system he represents; it is therefore possible that in some Greek states the malcontents against Macedonian supremacy may have

[1] The allusion was intended (being made in 1886) for Lord Spencer's case, as he was then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It has, however, since proved to be true in other cases.

been either political irreconcilables, or men who had no motive except a desire to escape poverty and therefore to modify the laws to their advantage, which the vice-regent of the empire forbade. For, as I have said, the rich, by becoming rich suddenly and from without, had made the poor poorer, and no doubt squandered their own fortunes with ostentation and insolence. They seem to have bought up land too, probably from people who saw their good fortune and hoped to imitate it; for we see in the following generations the *Land Question* coming forward and forming one branch of the socialistic movement of the third century B.C.

But how completely wealth, and with wealth political power, passed into new hands, appears most clearly from a phenomenon well known and yet not explained—the rise of the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues. The federative principle was the old and natural bond of union among small cantons which had no natural Capital city. But why had they no Capital? and why did they come into such prominence in the third century, after ages of obscurity? The decay of other states is no adequate cause; for it is not in comparison with Athens and Thebes, but actually and in relation to foreign powers, that we see their remarkable increase. A thousand states have relapsed into obscurity without producing any change to greatness in neighbours normally and traditionally obscure.

The cause must lie in the sudden increase of wealth among the Achaeans and Aetolians, while the rest of Greece was gradually growing poorer. And this sudden increase is easily explained. The two wildest and most rugged systems of alps in Greece are the region from Mount Parnassus westward, where we find no valley or arable land all the way to the coast of Acarnania, and the mountains of Achaia and Northern Arcadia—districts of which the bounds are

completely untraceable in the great complex of mountains which reach from Mount Chelmos to Mount Erymanthos. The inhabitants of these tracts could not possibly have a Capital, for the narrow margin along the north coast of Achaia never widens till you reach the isthmus of Corinth, or the plain of Elis, and this is also the case as regards Aetolia; there is nowhere room for a large town. Wherever there was a rich valley or plateau of arable land in Greece, there you find capital cities. The plain of Sparta is the richest of all, then come those of Argos and Messene; Tegea and Mantinea occupy a high but rich and level country; Megalopolis a lower, but equally rich plain; Athens is surrounded by arable land; and so it is with all the cities through Greece. The Achaeans and Arcadians—for there is no distinction to be drawn when we leave the coast—and the Phocians and Aetolians were shepherds, wandering up and down the mountains as the seasons changed, and living a poor and frugal life. Hence they had long been the recognised mercenaries of the Greek world. No doubt the campaigns of Alexander induced this fashion to spread to every state in Greece. But the more civilised and luxurious Greeks were inferior both in strength and endurance to the mountaineers, and also came later into the field. Hence these adventurers reaped the first and far the richest harvest when El Dorado was discovered in the East.[1] The wealth which they brought home produced that sudden and curious rise in their importance which is the main feature of the politics of Hellenistic Greece. The Aetolians are spoken of as rolling in wealth, luxuriating in public buildings,

[1] In the history of Egypt for the next two centuries, the Aetolians appear to have secured the profitable military posts to a quite disproportionate extent. Achaeans and Arcadians are also frequent, and these three together outbalance all the rest of Greece.

pictures, and statues. The Achaean League, as we know it, is an aristocratic, or rather plutocratic league, arranged with a view to give the rich preponderance. Is this likely to have been tolerated if a large part of the population consisted of poor and roving shepherds?

Polybius, in his account of the rise of the Achaean League,[1] omits this cause altogether; but I think his explanation of the phenomenon quite inadequate, and that of rather a blind partisan. Originally, no doubt, they were remarkable neither for wealth nor extraordinary courage. But that applies to the days before Alexander, and they were then accordingly obscure. He attributes their rise—(1) To the consistently democratic character of their institutions—a statement not to be reconciled with the frequent tyrannies among them; (2) to their recognised honesty as umpires in many international disputes, just as one might cite the honesty of the Swiss or Belgians, because Geneva nowadays, or Brussels, is neutral ground, where greater powers have brought their quarrels into court. But how, I should like to know, can these causes explain the parallel growth of the Aetolian League, to which he denies all respectable qualities? My explanation, on the contrary, answers in both cases, and is an undoubted *vera causa*, which is the only philosophical hypothesis to assume.

But the career of Alexander himself was too brief—like a terrible meteor—to allow social changes to be completed during his campaign. The feelings, however, and the facts, which we have reviewed, and which give a foretaste of what was to come, were briefly these. First, the rapid and complete antiquating of patriotic politics and politicians in Greece, who could henceforth aspire to nothing beyond communal liberty for the Greek cities. All chance of domination was gone for ever. Secondly, the persistence of the older

[1] ii. 38.

patriots in their senseless opposition to Macedonia. We cannot but blame them, though we may excuse them. The march of events was fabulously rapid and wonderful, such as the world has never seen since. How could elderly men brought up in narrow views possibly comprehend it? There resulted, thirdly, a feeling of contempt and dislike of Macedonians towards Greeks, and an inclination to deny them a share in the spoil, in spite of the desire of Alexander and the best of his generals to identify themselves with the Greeks, and fuse Hellenic culture with Macedonian force. This antagonism is an active element of disturbance, and of loss to the Greeks, in the coming century. Fourthly, this feeling was intensified as regards the home politicians of Greece, by the fact that the two best classes of the population abandoned politics, and left it to the old, the venal, and the crotchety. For the energetic went off to seek better fortunes and larger scope in Asia, and the thoughtful retired from public life into the schools of philosophy or the path of letters. Fifthly, the conditions of wealth were rapidly changing. Poor men were coming back rich, and nations of mercenaries were becoming richer than nations of traders or husbandmen. The amount of ready money, moreover, had increased enormously, and caused a rise in prices disastrous to people who lived on fixed incomes.

So far I have spoken only of Greece proper; let me say something, before concluding this chapter, on the condition of Asia Minor and the isles. We are very badly informed about these important and populous communities, for a very obvious reason. Their geographical position had brought them constantly under the very mild and lax despotism of Persian kings and satraps, so that they had forgotten to make much ado about degrees of theoretical liberty, and had turned instead to the pursuit of material prosperity. I

take Corinth in actual Greece to have been the type of these rich and stirring cities Ephesus, Colophon, Smyrna, Magnesia, and others. Corinth was always one of the centres of Greece as regards wealth, culture, and commerce. But through the greater part of Greek history it takes little independent action in politics, and rather falls in with the keener action of far smaller towns like Sicyon, or of poorer states. The Asiatic towns depended altogether on keeping up good relations with the interior, which gave them great opportunities of acquiring wealth by means of transit or carrying trade. For as culture, and with it luxury, increased, there must have been an increasing mutual demand for the special products of Greece and of Asia. These towns, then, were mostly content with any strong government which allowed them local independence, and did not interfere with their trade by heavy duties.

A peculiar class formed an important exception. These were the island cities, which were secure from land attack, and could only be held by a power which possessed maritime supremacy. Such towns demanded one thing only, but one thing absolutely—the safety of the water-ways. As soon as the maritime supremacy became administered with laxity, or disputed, the seas swarmed with those freebooters who were hardly looked on as criminals in earlier Greek society—perhaps on account of the exorbitant profits of early merchantmen. The idea of federation among these cities, and the establishment of a joint control, was not yet carried out, though the project must have been in the air. We see, moreover, the better position of the island cities by the fact that such coast settlements as could wall out the mainland and become practically islands, only assailable by sea, did so with care. Such were Halicarnassus, Pontic Heraclea, Byzantium, and others.

Of the interior of these communities, or of their social life, we hear hardly a word. The exactions to which they were exposed during the next fifty years of war were such that, had not their wealth been very great, they must have been totally ruined. But in many respects they were no doubt important vehicles for Hellenism, stepping-stones between purer Greece and purer Asia; intermediate in culture and in political sentiments.

As regards their politics, we have one fact, or set of facts, which illustrates more clearly than anything I know the complete inanity of the enthusiasm for democracy which is so much talked about as the cardinal political virtue of the Greeks. The Macedonians are set down as the destroyers of liberty in Greece, because they everywhere put themselves in relation with an oligarchy, or small aristocracy, which they attached to their interests, and through which they held Greece quiet, or at least controlled it. Hence they abolished in Athens and elsewhere low franchise, manhood suffrage, and those other 'palladia of liberty' so fashionable even nowadays. But how vain the accusation, and how shallow, appears from the conduct of Alexander in Asia Minor. There too the Persians had long pursued a policy analogous to that of Philip of Macedon; they held the coast and island cities in check by the influence of a small number of men in each place, and so favoured oligarchy. Alexander reversed this policy in Asia, and brought to power the democracies which the Persians had gradually abolished.[1] Whether this was indeed a wise measure may well be doubted. It might have been easy enough to bring the oligarchies into the same

[1] Mardonius had actually established them in earlier days, when he found the tyrants unpopular and untrustworthy. Yet Herodotus (vi. 43) evidently expected his readers to think it impossible that Persia should favour democracy.

relation to the conqueror of Darius as that in which they had stood to that monarch, and no doubt such a set of governments would have been far more manageable and more faithful than newly restored and turbulent democracies.

But apparently Alexander did not take the trouble to establish this far-seeing policy. It was enough for him to upset the adherents of Persia and establish their opponents in every city. Thus the so-called tyrant and abolisher of liberty in Greece appeared as the liberator and democratic champion of Asia Minor. The fact was that to him all such distinctions were idle, as they were to all the deeper thinkers of the day. The real question was to have a just government, and secure men's personal liberties in each state by a stable and moderate control. When the Greeks revolted in 330 B.C., and had been conquered in Arcadia by Antipater, Alexander gave them easy terms; he paid the compliment to Athenian sentiment of sending them back from Susa the ancient statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton, which had once been the sole ornament of the platform over the agora (known to all earlier Athenians as the *orchestra*), and which had been carried away by Xerxes.

It strikes us as all the more strange that just before the close of his life he should have sent to Greece two orders, very oppressive—the one to sentiment, the other to social arrangements — namely, that he should receive divine honours,[1] and that all exiles should return to their homes.

[1] Mr. Hogarth has argued, with much ingenuity (in the *Historical Review* for 1887), from the lateness of any formal mention of this demand, that the statement is apocryphal, and that Alexander never claimed divine honours. These conclusions I cannot accept. For in the first place it is certain that in Egypt and in the East he did receive such honours. The whole narrative of Callisthenes regarding the visit to the oasis of Ammon, quoted in Strabo (xvii. 1, § 43), is inconsistent with any other view. So also is the statement quoted by the

Sentimental grievances are, as we know, very deep-seated and hard to cure, but still there was room in the Greek Olympus for another deity without any serious revolution; there was no room in most Greek states for exiles without new banishments and new confiscations, for the property of the exiles was divided and occupied—in some cases even for the second generation; it had passed into new hands; how were the returning crowds of men, most of them paupers, to be provided for? How were their claims upon their old property to be settled? The evidence we have is so fragmentary that a general conclusion as to the conduct of these matters throughout the Greek world is hardly warranted. But this much seems certain, that while no state in Greece thought fit to make the question of apotheosis a *casus belli*, the Athenians and Aetolians were very determined to fight out the question of the exiles. On the other hand the

same author from Megasthenes (xvii. 1, § 11), that he desired to conquer Arabia because he heard that as the natives worshipped only Zeus and Dionysus *τρίτον ἑαυτὸν τιμήσεσθαι θεόν*, if he subdued them. Nor is there any other explanation possible for the jibe of the Macedonians in this revolt from him at Babylon, mentioned by Arrian, that he should seek support *from his father*, meaning from Jupiter Ammon. So much for the East. Now let us consider the Hellenic side. What was the meaning of his calling his bastard son Herakles, a name quite contrary to Greek usage, and specially known as that of the son of Zeus and of a mortal woman? What was the meaning of Lysippus blaming Apelles (both being contemporaries of Alexander) because the latter had painted the king with a thunderbolt in his hand (Plut. *de Isid.* 24)? What in fine was the meaning of the retort of Pytheas (Plut. *Apophtheg.* 6), another contemporary, who, when he rose up to oppose the decrees concerning Alexander at Athens, and was met by the objection, *σὺ νέος ὢν τολμᾷς λέγειν περὶ τηλικούτων;* answered: *καὶ μὴν Ἀλέξανδρος, ὃν ψηφίζετε θεόν, ἐμοῦ νεώτερός ἐστι?* All these indications point in the same direction, and tell us that a court poet was even ridiculed by old Antigonus for making him the son of the Sun and a god; I conclude therefore that by general consent, and with his own wish and approval, Alexander was deified even by the Greeks during his life.

inscriptions found at several cities of Asia Minor attest the appointment of a small commission of citizens (three or five) to arbitrate these difficult questions of property in a legal way. Though we may infer that the royal domain around most of the Asiatic cities may have been applied with the king's consent to mitigate the difficulty, yet even without this we might have anticipated much more docility in the Asiatic Greeks than in their European brethren; and that is what our scanty evidence suggests.[1]

To the Athenians and Spartans and their neighbours the Royal Message was a warning that Alexander was tired of condoning disloyalty, and that if they persisted in a war of sentiment against him, not even their treaty of Corinth, with its guarantee of internal autonomy, would save them. For they were the most obstinate opponents of his great idea—the fusion of nationalities. The Macedonians complained, and even openly revolted, but were persuaded or subdued; the Asiatics, even the great Persian barons who fought him almost to extermination in Sogdiana, had loyally accepted him at last. These Greek patriots were the only hopeless irreconcilables. So the increasing impatience of opposition in Alexander drove him to regard their persistence as intolerable, and he let loose upon them, if I may so say, 20,000 wanderers, most of them trained soldiers, who would supply him with a nucleus of adherents in every city, and at all events so occupy the Greeks as to make them turn from their snarling criticisms to more serious questions at home.

The death of Alexander stopped the carrying out of these designs, but the picture left us of the host of exiles assem-

[1] Cf. the letter of Antigonus to the Teians in Dittenberger's *Sylloge* i. No. 126.

bling at the holy truce of Olympia, and there meeting not only their friends but their enemies and their supplanters, tells us plainly what agitation there must have been throughout Greece.[1] How many must have hurried to take their money out of *visible* property, and place it in *invisible*, as it was then termed! How many must have entrusted it to foreign guest-friends, or to roving merchants, when they foresaw the prompt return of the embittered exiles to their homes!

Yet this agitation, the chief kind of agitation which disturbed the cities of Hellenistic Greece, came after a quiet period, only once disturbed since the accession of Alexander. Niebuhr tells us in his Lectures that he used to dispute about this with his friend Thiersch, who thought it a very happy period at Athens, and consequently through Greece.[2] Niebuhr, brought up in the terrible days of Napoleon's despotism in Germany, and in the glories of the Wars of Liberation, thought it a miserable time, for he sees the whole period through the eyes of Demosthenes, and the so-called patriot party who have left us their complaints.

The course of this book will help us to form our own judgments on this question. Suffice it now to say that the short life of Alexander epitomises the whole history of Hellenism. There were within it periods of quiet, when people went to hear orations and comedies, when philosophers had their schools undisturbed, and art and commerce flourished; other days also of anxiety, when property and even communal liberty—the only sort now to be hoped for—were in jeopardy. For from this time the Greek cities

[1] Diod. xviii. 8, for the letter and its reception at Olympia by 20,000 exiles from their respective cities.

[2] Especially under Casander. The dispute was as old as Strabo (ix. 1, 20). We wish we knew who the ἔνιοι were who praised the ten years under Casander as the best moment at Athens.

cease to be imperial, or capitals in the proper sense, and become distinctly provincial.[1] Their highest aim is culture, both of intellect and taste, and as universities only, or as art centres, can they retain the interest of the world. On the other hand, the life of kings and of their courts is already determined by the great prototype which they all copy, but afar off—the royalty and court of Alexander. From him and his court was derived a type of capital and of king, which is found in all the kingdoms of the day, and which contributed perhaps more than anything to fix the character of the succeeding century. Some account, therefore, of the leading Diadochi seems as necessary to an estimate of the age as an account of the leading thinkers in Athens or the artists in Sicyon.

But we must take them in broad outlines, and avoid adventuring ourselves into the shifting sand-hills of that desert of wars which, as has already been remarked, has deterred students from penetrating to the fruitful parts of the age which lie within and beyond them. We may then, by way of contrast, seek to show what was going on in the Greek provinces of the Macedonian Empire while the kings were disputing for supremacy. When the conflict is over, and the form and compass of the new states is determined, we shall find all the once separate societies approximating, and running into one great stream—all the monarchs essaying to do what Ptolemy attempted from the first with lasting success, and Attalus too attempted, whether independently or not, with a talent which certainly gained five, if it did not equal Ptolemy's ten.

[1] I do not go so far, however, as to say that they abandoned the theory, or even the practice, of treating with neighbouring cities or with kings as distinct and independent polities, whose relations with each such neighbour were distinctly *international*.

Let me insist on one point more in concluding this chapter. Modern as were the Periclean, and still more the Demosthenic ages, if we compare them either to the Dark or Middle Ages in Europe, they are to the Hellenistic age ancient and quaint. No political thinkers go back to them, no artist, save the sculptor, ever thinks even of imitating them. The luxury, the literary criticism, the license, the languor of the new age are those of the most modern days and of the most *blasé* society. The political problems too are those of a world not growing but decaying, and yet so fruitful in decay as to lay the seeds of future history beneath its ruins.

CHAPTER II

THE REVOLUTION IN HELLENIC LIFE MADE BY ALEXANDER

THERE was no king throughout all the Eastern world in the third century B.C. who did not set before him Alexander as the ideal of what a monarch ought to be. His transcendent figure so dominates the imagination of his own and the following age, that from studying his character we can draw all the materials for the present chapter. For this purpose the brilliant sketch of Plutarch, who explicitly professes to write the life and not the history of the king, is on the whole more instructive than the detailed chronicle of Arrian. From both we draw much that is doubtful and even fabulous, but much also which is certain and of unparalleled interest, as giving us a picture of the most extraordinary man that ever lived. The astonishing appearance of this lad of twenty, hurried to the throne by his father's death, in the midst of turmoil within and foes without, surrounded by doubtful friends and timid advisers, without treasury, without allies—and yet at once and without hesitation asserting his military genius, defeating his bravest enemies, cowing his disloyal subjects, crushing sedition, and then starting to conquer Asia, and to weld together two continents by a new policy—this wonder was

indeed likely to fascinate the world, and if his successors aped the leftward inclination of his head and the leonine sit of his hair,[1] they were sure enough to try to imitate what was easier and harder—the ways of his court and the policy of his kingdom.

Quite apart from his genius, which was unique, his position in Greece was perfectly novel, in that he combined Hellenic training, language, and ideas with a totally un-Hellenic thing—royalty.[2] For generations, the Macedonian kings had been trying to assert themselves as real Greeks.[3] They had succeeded in having their splendid genealogy accepted—an undeniable gain in those days, but their other claims were as yet hardly established. It is true they had entertained great poets at their court, and had odes and tragedies composed for the benefit of their subjects, but none of them, not even Philip, who was just dead, had yet been accepted as a really naturalised Greek. Yet Philip had come closer to it than his predecessors; he had spent his youth in the glorious Thebes of Epaminondas; he trained himself carefully in the rhetoric of Athens, and could compose speeches and letters which passed muster even with such fastidious stylists as Demosthenes.[4] But though he could assume Greek manners and speak good Greek in his serious moments, when on his good behaviour, it was known that his relaxations were of a very different

[1] Plut. *Alex.* 4.

[2] As Herodotus (v. 20) had long since expressed it of an earlier Alexander in a striking phrase, *ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην Μακεδόνων ὕπαρχος*.

[3] Cf. the evidence in Grote's *History of Greece* x. 62; xi. 291. From Philip II. onward they occupied a place in the Delphic Amphictyony, and had been admitted to the Olympic games, a proof of Hellenedom. Alexander I., son of Amyntas, had extracted from the Hellenodicae this privilege for himself. Herodotus v. 22.

[4] On the letter of Philip in Demosthenes' works cf. Blass *Attische Beredsamkeit* iii. p. 348.

kind. Then he showed the Thracian [1]—then his Macedonian breeding came out.

Nevertheless he saw so clearly the importance of attaining this higher level that he spared no pains to educate his son, and with him his son's court, in the highest culture. We know not whether it was accident or his clear judgment of human character which made him choose Aristotle as Alexander's tutor—there were many other men employed to instruct him—but we feel how foreign must have been Aristotle's conversation at the palace and among the boon companions of Philip, and hence Mieza, a quiet place away from court, was chosen for the prince's residence. There Aristotle made a Hellene of him in every real sense. It is certain, if we compare Alexander's manifesto to Darius with what is called Philip's letter, that he did not write so well as his father;[2] but he learned to know and love the great poets, and to associate with men of culture and of sober manners. Every one testifies to the dignity and urbanity of his address, even if at late carouses with intimates he rather bored the company with self-assertion and boasting. But this social defect was not unknown among the purest Hellenes. All through his life he courted Greek letters, he attended Greek plays, he talked in Greek to Greek men, and we can see how deep his sympathy with Hellenedom was from his cutting remark—*in vino veritas*—to two Greeks sitting at the fatal banquet where the Macedonian veteran, Clitus, broke out into indecent altercation. 'Don't you feel like demi-gods among savages when you are sitting

[1] As we say of a Russian that he shows the Tartar. The analogy of the Macedonians in Greece to the Russians in modern Europe is a favourite topic with historians, who often compare Philip of Macedon with Peter the Great.

[2] Arrian ii. 14. Cf. also Aeschines *de Fals. Leg.* c. 18, on Philip's accomplishments.

in company with these Macedonians?'[1] It may be said that Hellenedom was less fastidious in the days of Alexander than in the days of his predecessors. I need not argue that question; suffice it to say that even had he made no world-conquests he would have been recognised as a really naturalised Hellene, and fit to take his place among the purest Greeks, in opposition to the most respectable barbarians. The purest Hellene, such as the Spartan Pausanias, was liable to degradation of character from the temptations of absolute power no less than a Macedonian or a Roman.

But on the other hand he was a king in a sense quite novel and foreign to the Greeks. They recognised one king, the King of Persia, as a legitimate sovran, ruling in great splendour, but over barbarians. So they were ready to grant such a thing as a king over other barbarians of less importance; but a king over Greeks, in the proper sense of the word, had not existed since the days of legendary Greece. There were indeed tyrants, plenty of them, and some of them mild men and fond of culture, friends of poets, and respectable men; and there were the kings of Sparta. But the former were always regarded as arch-heretics were regarded by the Church in the Middle Ages, as men whose virtues were of no account and whose crime was unpardonable; to murder them was a heroic deed, which wiped out all the murderer's previous sins.

[1] Even in Polybius Macedonians occupy a doubtful position, being sometimes spoken of as Greeks and sometimes not. Philip V. derided the Aetolians when they called him a Macedonian, and retorts that they themselves are very doubtful Greeks. Polyb. xviii. 5. E. Curtius, *GG* iii. 397 shows that the hesitation to accept them as Greeks arose, not from their strange language—the Hellenic Acarnanians spoke barbarously—but from their inferior culture. Their language is proved by Fick to be substantially Greek. I note that the Egyptian demotic documents always speak of them as Greeks.

On the other hand, the latter were only hereditary, respected generals of an oligarchy, the real rulers of which were the ephors. Neither of these cases even approached the idea of a sovran, as the Macedonians and as the kingdoms of mediaeval and modern Europe have conceived it.

For this implied in the first place a legitimate succession, such as the Spartan kings indeed possessed, and with it a divine right in the strictest sense. As the Spartan, so the Macedonian kings came directly from Zeus, through his greatest hero-sons, Herakles and Aeakus. But while the Spartan kings had long lost, if they ever possessed, the rights of Menelaus, who could offer to give a friend seven inhabited towns as a gift, while they only retained the religious pre-eminence of their pedigree, the kings of Macedonia had preserved all their ancient privileges. Grote thinks them the best representatives of that prehistoric sovranty which we find in the Greece of Homer.[1] But all through his history he urges upon us the fact that there was no settled constitutional limit to the authority of the kings even in cases of life and death. On the other hand, German inquirers, who are better acquainted with absolute monarchy, see in the assembly of free Macedonians—occasionally convened, especially in cases of high treason or of a succession to the throne—a check like that of the Commons in earlier England. There seem in fact to have been two powers, both supreme, which could be brought into direct collision any day, and so might produce a dead-lock only to be removed by a trial of strength. Certain it is that Macedonian kings often ordered to death, or to corporal punishment and torture, free citizens and even nobles. It is equally certain that the kings often formally appealed to an assembly of soldiers or of peers (ἑταῖροι) to decide in cases of life

[1] Cf. E. Curtius *GG* iii. 397.

and death. Such inconsistencies are not impossible where there is a recognised divine right of kings, and when the summoning of an assembly lies altogether in the king's hands. Except in time of war, when its members were together under arms, the assembly had probably no way of combining for a protest, and the low condition of their civilisation made them indulgent to acts of violence on the part of their chiefs.

Niebuhr, however (*Vorträge* ii. 371), suggests a very probable solution of this difficulty. He compares the case of the Frankish kings, who were only princes among their own free men, but absolute lords over lands which they conquered. Thus many individual kings came to exercise absolute power illegally by transferring their rights as conquerors to those cases where they were limited monarchs. It is very possible too that both they and the Macedonian kings would prefer as household officers nobles of the conquered lands, over whom they had absolute control. Thus the constitutional and the absolute powers of the king might be confused, and the extent of either determined by the force of the man who occupied the throne.

That Alexander exerted his supreme authority over all his subjects is quite certain. And yet in this he differed absolutely from a tyrant, such as the Greeks knew, that he called together his peers and asked them to pass legal sentence upon a subject charged with grave offences against the crown. No Greek tyrant ever could do this, for he had around him no halo of legitimacy, and moreover, he permitted no order of nobility among his subjects.

It appears that for a long time back the relations of king and nobles had been in Macedonia much as they were in the Middle Ages in Europe. There were large landed proprietors, and many of them had sovran rights in their

own provinces. Not only did the great lords gather about the king as their natural head, but they were proud to regard themselves as his personal servants, and formed the household, which was known as the *θεραπεία* in Hellenistic times. Earlier kings had adopted the practice of bringing to court noble children, to be the companions of the prince, and to form an order of *royal pages*; so no doubt Greek language and culture had been disseminated among them, and perhaps this was at first the main object. But in Alexander's time they were a permanent part of the king's household, and were brought up in his personal service, to become his aides-de-camp and his lords-in-waiting as well as his household brigade of both horse and foot guards, and perform for him many semi-menial offices which great lords and ladies are not ashamed to perform for royalty, even up to the present day.[1]

I will add but one more point, which is a curious illustration of the position of the Macedonian kings among their people. None of them contented himself with one wife, but either kept concubines, like all the kings in Europe, and even in England till George III., or even formally

[1] 'At the court of Louis XIV.' says Buckle (*Civilisation* i. 615, orig. ed.) 'the most serious misunderstandings arose as to who should have the honour of giving the king his napkin as he ate his meals, and who was to enjoy the inestimable privilege of helping on the queen with her shift.' 'According to some authorities, a man ought to be a duke before his wife could be allowed to meddle with the queen's shift. According to others, the lady-in-waiting, whoever she might be, had the right, unless a princess happened to be present.' For these facts he cites contemporary authorities. See also his delightful account (*op. cit.* pp. 610 *sq.*) of the great conflict in France about the right of sitting in the king's presence: 'In comparison with this a mere struggle for political liberty faded into insignificance; and what made it still more exciting to the minds of the nobles was the extreme difficulty with which this great social problem was beset.' The details are most amusing, but would lead us away too far.

married second wives, as did Philip and Alexander. These practices led to constant and bloody tragedies in the royal family. Every king of Macedon who was not murdered by his relatives was at least conspired against by them. What is here, however, of consequence, is the social position of the royal bastards. They take their place not with the dishonoured classes, but among the nobles, and are all regarded as pretenders to the throne.

I need not point out to the reader the curious analogies of mediaeval European history. The facts seem based on the idea that the blood of kings was superior to that of the highest noble, and that even when adulterated by an ignoble mother, it was far more sacred than that of any subject. The Macedonians had not indeed advanced to the point of declaring all marriages with subjects morganatic, but they were not very far from it; for they certainly suffered from all the evils which English history as well as other histories can show, where alliances of powerful subjects with the sovran are permitted.

Thus Alexander the Great, the third Macedonian king of his name, stood forth really and thoroughly in the position assigned by Herodotus to his elder namesake—*ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην, a Greek man* in pedigree, education, and culture, *Μακεδόνων ὕπαρχος* (or *βασιλεύς*), *and king of the Macedonians*, a position unknown and unrecognised in the Greek world since the days of that Iliad which the conqueror justly prized, as to him the best and most sympathetic of all Hellenic books. Let us add that in the text, which Aristotle revised for him, there were assertions of royalty, including the power of life and death, which are expunged from our texts.[1] He had the sanction of divine right, but

[1] *πὰρ γὰρ ἐμοὶ θάνατος*, says Agamemnon, in a citation made by Aristotle himself from the Iliad, *Pol.* iii. 9, 2.

what was far more important, the practical control of life and death, regarding the nobility as his household servants, and the property of his subjects as his own, keeping court with considerable state, and in every respect expressing, as Grote says, the principle *l'État c'est moi*.[1]

A very few words will point out what changes were made in this position by his wonderful conquests. Though brought up in considerable state, and keeping court with all the splendour which his father's increased kingdom and wealth could supply, he was struck with astonishment, we are told, at the appointments of Darius's tents, which he captured after the battle of Issus. When he went into the bath prepared for his opponent, and found all the vessels of pure gold, and smelt the whole chamber full of frankincense and myrrh, and then passed out into a lofty dining tent with splendid hangings, and with the appointments of an oriental feast, he exclaimed to his staff: 'Well, this *is* something like royalty.' Accordingly there was no part of Persian dignity which he did not adopt. We hear that the expenses of his table—he always dined late—rose to about £400 daily, at which limit he fixed it. Nor is this surprising when we find that he dined as publicly as the kings of France in the old days, surrounded by a brilliant staff of officers and pages, with a bodyguard present, and a trumpeter ready to summon the household troops.[2] All manner of

[1] *History of Greece* x. 62.

[2] Plut. *Alex.* 20. His circle included from sixty to seventy guests. Others add that when he offered libation at table the trumpet sounded that all the army might know that the king drank to the gods. So Shakespeare *Hamlet* I. iv. 8-12:—

> The king doth wake to-night and takes his rouse,
> Keeps wassail, and the swaggering up-spring reels;
> And, as he drains his draughts of Rhenish down,
> The kettle-drum and trumpet thus bray out
> The triumph of his pledge.

delicacies were brought from the sea and from remote provinces for his table.[1]

In other respects, in dress and manners, he drifted gradually into Persian habits also. The great Persian lords, after a gallant struggle for their old sovran, loyally went over to his side. Both his wives were oriental princesses, and perhaps too little has been said by historians about the influence they must have had in recommending to him Persian officers and pages. The loyalty of these people, great aristocrats as they were, was quite a different thing from that of the Macedonians, who had always been privileged subjects, and who now attributed to their own prowess the king's mighty conquests. The orientals, on the other hand, accepted him as an absolute monarch, nay, as little short of a deity, to whom they readily gave the homage of adoration. It is a characteristic story that when the rude and outspoken Casander had just arrived at Babylon for the first time, on a mission from his father Antipater, the regent of Macedonia, he saw orientals approaching Alexander with their customary prostrations, and burst out laughing. Upon this Alexander was so enraged that he seized him by the hair and dashed his head against the wall, and there can be little doubt that the king's death, which followed shortly, saved Casander from a worse fate. Thus the distinction pointed out by Niebuhr[2] would lead Alexander to prefer the orientals, whom he had conquered,

Ephippus, Agatharchides, and others, quoted by Athenaeus xii. 538 *sq.* (or cf. the Frags. in C. Müller's Arrian, ed. Didot), exhaust themselves in describing the luxury of the court.

[1] We hear of tamed lions in his train, and of the efforts of his stewards to naturalise Macedonian flora in the royal gardens at Babylon. It was noted that all attempts at growing ivy in that dry and hot climate failed. Theophrastus *apud* Plut. *Symp.* iii. qu. 2, § 1.

[2] Above, p. 24.

and who were his absolute property, to the Macedonians, who were not only constantly grumbling but had even planned several conspiracies against him.

There was yet another feature in Alexander's court which marks a new condition of things. The keeping of a regular court journal, ἐφημερίδες, wherein the events of each day were carefully registered, gave an importance to the court which it had never before attained within Greek or Macedonian experience. The daily bulletins of his last illness are still preserved to us by Arrian and Plutarch from these diaries.[1] In addition to this we hear that he sent home constant and

[1] The *Royal Diary* (or *Court Journal*) gives the following account, to the effect that he revelled and drank at the dwelling of Medius; then rose up, took a bath, and slept; then again supped at the house of Medius, and again drank till far into the night. After retiring from the drinking party he again took a bath, after which he took a little food, and slept there, because he already felt feverish. He was carried out upon a couch for the sacrifices, in order that he might offer them, according to his daily custom. After performing the sacred rites he lay down in the banqueting hall till dusk. In the meantime he gave instructions to the officers about the expedition and voyage, ordering those who were going by land to be ready on the fourth day, and those who were going to sail to join him on the fifth day. From this place he was carried upon the couch to the river, where he got into a boat and sailed across the river to the park. There he again took a bath, and went to rest.

On the following day he took another bath, and offered the customary sacrifices. He then entered a tester-bed, and chatted with Medius. He also ordered his officers to meet him at daybreak. Having done this he ate a little supper, and was again conveyed into the tester-bed. The fever now raged the whole night without intermission. The next day he took a bath, after which he offered sacrifices, and gave orders to Nearchus and the other officers that the voyage should take place on the third day. The next day he bathed again, and offered the prescribed sacrifices. After performing the sacred rites he got no relief from the fever. Notwithstanding this, he summoned his officers and gave them instructions to have all things ready for the starting of the fleet. In the evening he took a bath, after which he was very ill. The next day he was transferred to the house near the swimming baths, where he offered the prescribed sacrifices. Though he was now very dangerously ill he

detailed public despatches to his mother and Antipater, in which he gave the minutest details of his life.[1]

In these the public learned a new kind of ideal of pleasure as well as of business. The Macedonian king, brought up in a much colder climate than Greece, among mountains which gave ample opportunity for sport, was so far not a 'Greek man' that he was less frugal as regards his living, and had very different notions of amusement. The Hellene, who was mostly a townsman, living in a country of dense cultivation, was beholden to the gymnasium and palaestra for his recreation, of which the highest outcome was the Olympic and other games, where he could

summoned the most responsible of his officers, and gave them fresh instructions about the voyage. On the following day he was with difficulty carried out to the sacrifices, which he offered; and none the less gave more orders to the officers about the voyage. The next day, though he was no better, he offered the prescribed sacrifices. He now gave orders that the generals should remain in attendance in the hall, and that the inferior commanders should remain at the gates. But being now in a most dangerous condition, he was carried from the park into the palace. When his officers entered the room he knew them indeed, but could no longer utter a word, being speechless. During the ensuing night and day, and the next night and day, he was in very high fever.

Such is the account given in the *Royal Diary*. In addition to this it states that the soldiers were very desirous of seeing him; and then there are details added which were not in the *Diary*.

This translation is from Mr. Chinnock's Arrian vii. 25, 26. It will be noticed that Alexander's assumption of divine attributes did not hinder his sacrificing to the traditional gods. The reader will also remark the absence of all mention of the Queen Roxane, or of any intercourse with her household. This was probably a matter of etiquette in the *Court Journal*, which was framed on oriental models. On the other hand, his letters to his mother Olympias seem to have been either included, or at least preserved, and afterwards made public.

[1] Plutarch (*an seni* etc. 11) says that a Seleucus (he does not say which king, but probably the first) used to say that if men knew what toil a sovran underwent in the mere writing and reading of letters, they would not pick up a diadem out of the dust.

attain glory by competition in athletic meetings. The men who prize this sort of recreation are always abstemious and careful to keep in hard condition by diet and special exercising of muscles. The Macedonian ideal was quite different, and more like that of our country gentleman, who can afford to despise bodily training in the way of abstinence, who eats and drinks what he likes, nay, often drinks to excess, but works off evil effects by those field sports which have always produced the finest type of man—hunting, shooting, fishing—in fact the life of the natural or savage man reproduced with artificial improvements.

Alexander took the Macedonian side strongly against the Greek in these matters. He is said to have retorted upon the people who advised him to run in the sprint race at Olympia, that he would do so when he found kings for competitors. But the better reason was that he despised that kind of bodily training; he would not have condescended to give up his social evenings, at which he drank freely; and above all he so delighted in hunting that he felt no interest in athletic meetings. When he got into the preserves of Darius he fought the lion and the bear, and incurred such personal danger that his adventures were commemorated by his fellow-sportsmen in bronze. He felt and asserted that this kind of sport, requiring not only courage and coolness but quick resource, was the proper training for war, in contrast to the athletic habit of body, which confessedly produced dulness of mind and sleepiness of body.[1]

This way of spending the day in the pursuit of large game, and then coming home to a late dinner and a jovial carouse,

[1] These practical defects seem to have been produced by a defective theory of physical training, which compelled the athlete to take huge meals of meat, quite at variance with the ordinary diet of the Greeks. Cf. Aristotle *Nic. Ethics* ii. 5 on the large amount a strong athlete (Milo) would require.

where the events of the day are discussed and parallel anecdotes brought out, was so distinctive as to produce a marked effect on the social habits of succeeding generations. The older Spartans had indeed similar notions; they despised competitions in the arena, and spent their time hunting in the wilds of Mount Taygetus; but the days for Sparta to influence the world were gone by, and indeed none but Arcadians and Aetolians among the Greeks had like opportunities.

It would require a separate treatise to discuss fully the innovations made by Alexander in the art of war. But here it is enough to notice, in addition to Philip's abandonment of citizen for professional soldiers, the new development Alexander gave to cavalry as the chief offensive branch of military service. He won all his battles by charges of heavy cavalry, while the phalanx formed merely the defensive wing of his line. He was even breaking up the phalanx into lighter order at the time of his death. So it came that the noblest and most esteemed of his Companions were cavalry officers, and from this time onward no general thought of fighting, like Epaminondas, a battle on foot. Eastern warfare also brought in the use of elephants, but this was against the practice of Alexander, who did not use them in battle, so far as we know.

I believe I was the first to call attention to the curious analogies between the tactics of Alexander and those of Cromwell. Each lived in an age when heavy cavalry were found to be superior to infantry, if kept in control, and used with skill. Hence each of them fought most of his battles by charging with his cavalry on the right wing, overthrowing the enemy's horse, and then, avoiding the temptation to pursue, charging the enemy's infantry in flank, and so deciding the issue. Meanwhile they both felt strong enough to disregard a defeat of their left wing by the enemy's horse,

which was not under proper discipline, and went far away out of the battle in pursuit. So similar is the course of these battles, that one is tempted to believe that Cromwell knew something of Alexander. It is not so. Each of these men found by his genius the best way of using the forces at his disposal. Alexander's Companions were Cromwell's Ironsides.

In one point, however, he still held to old and chivalrous ways, and so fell short of our ideal of a great commander. He always charged at the head of his cavalry, and himself took part in the thickest of the fight. Hence in every battle he ran the risk of ending the campaign with his own life. It may be said that he had full confidence in his fortune, and that the king's valour gave tremendous force to the charge of his personal companions. But nothing can convince us that Hannibal's view of his duties was not far higher, of whom it was noted that he always took ample care for his own safety, nor did he ever, so far as we know, risk himself as a combatant. Alexander's example, here as elsewhere, gave the law, and so a large proportion of his successors found their death on the battlefield. The aping of Alexander was apparently the main cause of this serious result.

Modern historians are divided as regards Alexander into two classes, first, those like Grote, who regard him as a partly civilised barbarian, with a lust for conquest, but with no ideas of organisation or of real culture beyond the establishment of a strong military control over a vast mass of heterogeneous subjects. Secondly, those like Droysen, who are the majority, and have better reasons on their side, feel that the king's genius in fighting battles was not greater than his genius in founding cities, not merely as outposts, but as marts, by which commerce and culture should spread through the world.[1] He is reported to have disputed with Aristotle,

[1] Strabo (ix. 1, 6) quotes Patrokles to the effect that in contrast to

who wished him to treat the orientals like a master—δεσποτικῶς—and to have asserted that his policy was to treat them as their leader—ἡγεμονικῶς. We know from Aristotle's *Politics* that with all his learning the philosopher had not shaken off Hellenic prejudices, and that he regarded the Eastern nations as born for slavery. Apart from the questionable nature of his theory, he can have known little of the great Aryan barons of Bactriana or Sogdiana, who had for centuries looked on the Greek adventurers they met as the Romans did in later days. But Alexander belongs to a different age from Aristotle, as different as Thucydides from Herodotus, contemporary though they were in their lives, and he determined to carry out the 'marriage of Europe and Asia.' To a Hellene the marriage with a foreigner would seem a more or less disgraceful concubinage. The children of such a marriage could not inherit in any petty Greek state. Now the greatest Macedonian nobles were allied to Median and Persian princesses, and the Greeks who had attained high official position at court, such as Eumenes, the chief secretary, were only too proud to be admitted to the same privilege.[1]

The fashion of making or cementing alliances by marriages becomes from this time a feature of the age. The kings who are one day engaged in deadly war are the next connected as father and son-in-law, or as brothers-in-law. No solemn peace seems to be made without a marriage, and yet these marriages seldom hinder the breaking out of new wars.

All the Greek historians blame the Persian tendencies of Alexander, his assumption of oriental dress and of foreign

the loose accounts of Alexander's Companions, the king loved accuracy, and had accurate reports of all the countries he conquered made out for him by the most competent officials.

[1] With Alexander, too, began the Hellenistic fashion of assigning ancestors from Greek mythology for the most distant oriental nations. Cf. Strabo xi. 14, § 12.

ceremonial. There was but one of his officers, Peukestas, who loyally followed his chief, and who was accordingly rewarded by his special favour. Yet if we remember Greek prejudices, and how trivial a fraction of the empire the Greeks were in population, we may fairly give Alexander credit for more judgment than his critics. No doubt the Persian dress was far better suited to the climate than the Macedonian. No doubt he felt that a handful of Macedonians could never hold a vast empire without securing the sympathy of the conquered. At all events he chose to do the thing his own way, and who will say that he should have done it as his critics prescribe?

The relations of the great king to the art of his day need not detain us long. His busy and agitated life did not permit him to be an art patron like the second Ptolemy of Alexandria or the first Attalus of Pergamum. But we know that he appreciated the great service which art could render to the splendour of his royalty, and the story survives that he would allow no sculptor but Lysippus, no painter but Apelles, to represent his semi-divine personality in bronze or on canvas. Whether the famous head at Florence is indeed the copy of Lysippus's work, and represents the conqueror, is not yet certain. But if it does, then, even in his assumed divinity, there are left the traces of human passion, the imperfection of human longing, the divine despair which attaches to the highest mortal natures, because they are high, and because they are mortal.

But both Lysippus and Apelles belonged to the older generation; we know of no younger artist that he favoured except the extravagant Deinocrates, with his colossal imaginings, which seem rather the dreams of a flatterer than the conceptions of an artist; and yet we shall find that there were younger artists in his day, worthy, if any ever were, of his patronage.

CHAPTER III

THE DIADOCHI AS EXECUTORS OF ALEXANDER'S IDEAS

When all the world was assembled or represented in Babylon, and was dumb with anxiety at Alexander's great preparations, men's hearts quaking and failing them for fear, a sudden blow came terrible beyond all expectation. The angel of death subdued the unconquerable king; in a few days of raging fever brought on by excess of sociality, he became speechless, then came the news that he was dead. It was impossible even for Q. Curtius, in his flights of rhetoric, to exaggerate the effects of that news. For if the master had been terrible, and kept men speechless with fear, how much more dreadful was the empire adrift without a guide! Alexander in his twelve years of sovranty, and his almost constant pursuit of new conquests, had not matured his system, or carried out distinctly his plans of unifying the empire. Many things were begun, many schemes projected, but Alexander had no time to complete them. Nor would he have given himself the time, so long as the madness of conquest was upon him. When advancing age had begun to tame that fiery spirit, and fatigue those muscles of iron, then indeed might the world have expected great things from his organising genius. But now his work had fallen unfinished from his master-hand, and who could accomplish it? Like all the

greatest conquerors, he had no single lieutenant in whom he or others trusted, as the proper successor to his power. He had, on the contrary, as is always the case, a large staff of highly-trained officers, of skilful civil servants, all jealous of his favour, and of their rivals, and only kept from breaking out into open quarrels by his constraining hand. In the case of Hephaestion and Craterus, who crossed swords in his presence, he was obliged solemnly to threaten to put either both, or the assailant, to death if such a thing happened again, though they were his two dearest friends in all the household.

Under these circumstances we might almost predict that as no one successor could take up the whole inheritance, everything must either be undone and fall into confusion during the struggles for the division of plunder; or else many of the conquered kingdoms must return to their old condition; or lastly, the ideas of Alexander might be carried out on a small scale, and within moderate limits, by the most cautious and careful of his imitators. All these results did in turn ensue, but the most remarkable feature is the apparent inability of the Greek-speaking world to fall back into the old grooves so dear to Hellenic patriots. The tyrant was dead, they may often have exclaimed; the tyranny yet lives.

It is not my intention to narrate even the broad features of the great struggles of the next forty-five years, beyond showing what the main issues were, and how far the principal successors (Diadochi) carried out the policy of Alexander. The lesser men, the side issues, the cross purposes, the confusion of parties, must all be omitted. It is owing to these complications that this period is a sealed book to the ordinary reader, and is hardly to be mastered even by the most painstaking student. But until we have learned, what old

historians never learned, that wars and marches in themselves have no interest, and are only accidentally part of human history, we shall never be able to clear the birth of Hellenism from the darkness which broods over it.

Yet the main issues were very clear. While two or three of the chief captains were ambitious enough to hope for the control of the whole empire, the more prudent and cautious had it quite fixed in their minds that each should receive a kingdom, or rather province, as satrap, in which he intended to secure himself permanently.[1]

But at the same time the affection and respect of the soldiery for Alexander were so great that no one could dare to dispossess his heirs — who were a foolish lad, half-brother of Alexander, Philip Arridaeus; a posthumous infant; and the widowed queen Roxane, who had promptly got rid of her rival Statira, lately married to Alexander at the great wedding-feast in Babylon. It was thought decent and was required by the army that a general regent or protector should be appointed to manage the empire for these minors till the son of Alexander came of age. Of course Perdikkas, the first appointed of these regents, thought to wrest all power to himself, and to coerce his former colleagues. And of course this attempt failed, despite the support of the able Eumenes, who was ready to fight the royal cause as the only safe one for a Greek among Macedonians. Perdikkas's first attempt to enforce his authority and to subdue Ptolemy in Egypt ended with his defeat and death.

With a new division of provinces, caused by these events, and the fall of Leonnatus and Craterus in battles against the Greeks and against Eumenes, whose position was gone with Perdikkas's death, the royal family passed into the keeping

[1] The general reader may pass by the following details, and resume on page 41.

of a new regent, the veteran Antipater, who was so loyal to them that he felt his son, Casander, was no proper successor to this office, and he bequeathed it to Polyperchon. This led to violent conflicts in Greece and Macedonia between Polyperchon and the royal family on one hand, and Casander on the other, who ultimately asserted himself lord of Macedonia and Greece, and put to death all the remaining members of the royal family—Olympias, Philip Arridaeus, and the unfortunate child Alexander. He held, from the beginning, with Ptolemy, the theory that independent satraps should secure independent kingdoms, ridiculed the rights of the royal family, and obtained the occasion to carry his policy into deadly practical effect. Meanwhile in Asia a new pretender to universal sovranty had risen in Antigonus, perhaps the ablest of Alexander's generals, who had been at first forced to fly for his life from the regent Perdikkas, but who afterwards obtained the central province of Asia Minor for his share,[1] and soon showed that he intended to extend it as far as his resources would allow him. He subdued Eumenes after long struggles in the east of Persia; he almost seized Seleucus, satrap of Babylon, who fled for his life to Ptolemy; and thus becoming lord of all Asia he began to extend his ambition to the rest of Alexander's empire. But though ably seconded by his son Demetrius, to whom he entrusted the European part of his campaigns and the raising of the Greek provinces against Casander, he was overmatched by the combination of all the rest against him. His attack on Egypt failed, just as that of Perdikkas had failed. Demetrius, though often and brilliantly successful, was not able to subdue Casander, or indeed the power of Rhodes in alliance with him; and some successes of Ptolemy

[1] He had been governor for Alexander there from the beginning of the invasion of Asia, cf. below, p. 46.

in Palestine enabled this satrap to send back Seleucus to Babylon, to construct for himself a great empire. Another strong power had been formed by Lysimachus, now for some years satrap of Thrace, and the coalition of the four powers —Macedonia, Thrace, Babylonia, and Egypt—proved too much for Antigonus. The long struggle, in which he strove to win by attacking his enemies in detail, was decided against him first by the brilliant strategy of Lysimachus, who held him at bay for a whole campaign, then by the allied powers of Thrace, Macedonia, and all the East, on the field of Ipsus (301 B.C.). The power of Seleucus was shown by this battle to be the greatest among the Diadochi. For some years longer Demetrius, Antigonus's son, kept up a war of knight-errantry about the Aegean. He was at last taken prisoner by Seleucus and died of a broken heart.

All this time Ptolemy in Egypt was quietly consolidating his kingdom, and did not even take active part in the great campaign of Ipsus. But Lysimachus had extended his sway from Thrace far into Asia Minor, where he had made settlements and outpost forts from the beginning of his reign. Thus he gradually came into collision with Seleucus,[1] who had succeeded to Antigonus's domain. But this conflict also ended with the great battle of Korupedion (281 B.C.) near the Hellespont, in which Lysimachus lost his life. The aged Seleucus seems to have been seized with a longing to recover the ancient home of his youth and end his days in Macedonia. He was almost master of all that Alexander had conquered. Egypt alone could have resisted. But on the very threshold of his home he was murdered by the ribald son of Ptolemy, who had been exiled from his Egyptian heritage

[1] The family quarrels which are alleged as the cause of the rupture were only contributory to the main question—the rivalry of interests. On these quarrels cf. my *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 114.

by his politic father. This adventurer's assumption of the royalty of Macedonia was cut short by the terrible invasion of the Kelts (Galatae), who killed him in battle, swept all Macedonia, and carried terror into Asia. The Keltic scourge, combined with the recent death of the last veteran of Alexander's staff, and the accession of a new generation of kings, closed the forty-five years' war of the Diadochi. Asia, apart from the Greek cities of the coast, remained in undisputed possession of Antiochus, Seleucus's son. Ptolemy Philadelphus was settled in Egypt and Cyrene. Of the three princes who had in turn seized the throne of Macedonia after the despatch of Casander's young and feeble sons—Demetrius, Pyrrhus of Epirus, and Lysimachus—only one had left an heir. This heir, Antigonus Gonatas, son of Demetrius, became the real founder of the house of Macedonia, with authority more or less complete over Greece. So the Hellenistic world begins a new era.

I have left out in this sketch all the secondary names, such as Peukestas, Triptolemus, Asander, not to speak of other Alexanders and Ptolemies, which bewilder the reader and have no effect on the main issues. Thus it will be seen that discounting the four important generals disposed of by death early in the struggle — Leonnatus fighting against the Greeks with Antipater, Craterus returning into Asia after the victory of Crannon, and meeting Eumenes by the way, Perdikkas in his attempt on Egypt, and Eumenes crushed by Antigonus—there remain five men who disposed of the fortunes of Alexander's empire. These, in the order of their seniority, were Antipater of Macedonia; Antigonus of Phrygia, or rather of Western Asia; Lysimachus of Thrace; Ptolemy of Egypt; and Seleucus of Babylon or Eastern Asia.

Eumenes, indeed, deserves a word of notice, if it were

only to show how deep was the gulf which separated the Greeks in Alexander's army from the Macedonians. This youth of Cardia, probably of humble origin, pushed his way even under Philip, and was promoted by Alexander to one of the most important offices in the empire; he was keeper of the Records of the Court, and chief of the Foreign Correspondence Department. He was afterwards promoted to high military rank, taking Perdikkas's place when he replaced Hephaestion.[1] Plutarch's very interesting life of him appears to be based on two sources, the one Eumenes's townsman Hieronymus, who shared with him all his chequered fortunes; the other an adverse witness, probably of Macedonian sympathies. So we have the faults as well as the merits of his character brought out in strong relief. As to his ability there can be no question; had he been bred a Macedonian noble he would probably have held together an empire for Alexander's son, and perhaps changed the face of history. But his colonial Greek birth—a cursed Chersonite was what the Macedonian privates called him—and the qualities it entailed, were fatal to him. He was mean in money matters, no doubt laying by treasure for the evil day, for he knew that on Alexander alone his prosperity depended. When the king died he stood aloof, saying 'that a foreigner had no business to meddle in the quarrels of Macedonians,'[2] and great was their indignation afterwards when they heard that the noble Craterus had fallen in battle against a stranger foisted in among the leaders, who had followed the army with scrib-

[1] Droysen ii. 1, 303 will not believe this, because Arrian says no one was formally promoted into Hephaestion's place. But to assume, as he does, that Eumenes was only a secretary, and then turned suddenly into a first-rate general, is absurd. He must have had military command under Alexander.

[2] Plut. *Eum.* 3.

bling materials, not with shield and spear. In the subsequent troubles he was eminently faithful to the royal family, and was the mainstay of their interests, but evidently because he saw that his only chance of gaining importance was as their lieutenant, not as an independent prince. In the war of the Eastern satraps against Antigonus the Macedonians, both men and leaders, found they could not do without him in battle, for he was the only one among them who was a match for Antigonus, whom he could outwit even when he could not defeat him. But among the luxurious and tyrannous satraps, spoilt by long despotism and heedless extravagance under Alexander, who courted and fawned upon the soldiery 'as in a democracy,' and were ready to assassinate the Greek adventurer the day after the victory; among the abandoned veterans, perhaps an army as ruthless as the soldiers of Cortez or the grand Catalan company in mediaeval Greece, victory or defeat was equally fatal to him. His strange device of a royal tent, where the leaders met in council as lieutenants in presence of an imaginary Alexander, though it shows curious evidence for the superstitious reverence in which the king's memory was held, yet seems a sorry expedient to maintain an impossible position. Indeed, all through the career of this Greek, there is something of that weakness so often shown by the nation, a genius rather akin to astuteness than to breadth of grasp, a suppleness both of mind and body indicative rather of the clever minister than the great ruler; 'no great speaker,' says Plutarch,[1] 'but wily and persuasive, as may be seen from his despatches.'

This then was the type of Greek who foisted himself into the Macedonian empire. So long as the condition of the world was one of war, when the cavalry of Peers and the

[1] *Eum.* II.

phalanx were supreme, he was sure to be treated (except in the crisis of a campaign) with insolence and disdain. But no settled court could afford to despise him, and we may be sure that many such men became the grand viziers in the palaces of the far East, while they fill in the courts of the next generation, under established kings, every post of importance. Eumenes was only forty-five at his death; he therefore belongs to the youngest of the companions of Alexander, being not much older than the king himself. Let us turn back to the veterans, who regarded him not only as an upstart, but as a premature rival.

ANTIPATER, placed by his long control of Alexander's European possessions in a prominent position, was probably the best servant the king ever had. He had grown grey in Philip's service, and with Parmenio shared his confidence. But he was evidently a far abler man than Parmenio, and a general of the greatest reputation, who administered fearlessly and well in the king's interest. Small and ugly in appearance,[1] mean also in the estimation of soldiers debauched by oriental largess, he appears to have had no loftier views than loyalty to the house of Philip.[2] He had no taste for culture, no sympathy for the Greeks; he so hated the upstart Eumenes that the latter would not venture into Macedonia after Alexander's death, and his treatment of Greek revolutions, his cold insistence upon the surrender and death of the Athenian patriots—Demosthenes, Hypereides,

[1] Suidas *sub voc.* Κρατερός, where he is contrasted with that officer of splendid appearance and popular manners. Cf. also Plut. *Phoc.* 29.

[2] Antigonus of Karystos told in his memoirs (Athen. x. 435 d) that when Philip sat down to drink with his friends he used to say, 'It is enough for us if Antipater is sober,' and that he hustled the dice-board under a seat when Antipater suddenly came in upon him at his gambling. These stories show the strict and serious character borne by Antipater.

and others—shows his sense of duty to his cause, and his contempt of all sentimental politics. With him we can find no new ideas, no promotion of Hellenism, yet we cannot but respect the rare devotion of the old man to his master's house, which prompted him to disinherit, as it were, his son Casander, whose sentiments he well knew, and bequeath the main charge of the royal cause to his old companion in arms, Polyperchon.

Yet all the time that he was governor of Macedonia he kept wearying the king with complaints of the conduct and violences of Olympias, the queen-mother. She too was not slow to write, and so Alexander was troubled between the careful and honest loyalty of Antipater, which he could not but respect, and his filial duty to the haughty mother, whom he could not cease to love. The death of Antipater, apparently from old age,[1] followed so soon upon the division at Triparadeisus, where he was declared regent, that during the great wars his part of the empire was represented by Casander, a far more interesting figure, to whom we will return when we have disposed of the older generation. It is in connexion with Casander that we may mention the mischievous acts of Polyperchon, which were caused by the active opposition of that prince.

ANTIGONUS, who was killed at the great battle of Ipsus in 301 B.C., aged eighty-four, was therefore about thirty years older than Alexander, and only seventeen or eighteen years younger than Antipater, and yet there seems in him an advance towards newer ideas. Of great stature, somewhat coarse in the flavour of his wit, and apparently cultivating a sort of rude camp-manner popular among the soldiers, he was yet in his ambition anything but a mere loyal officer of Philip's house, and in his culture no mere Macedonian

[1] He was about eighty, and died in 319 B.C.

spear-eater.[1] Being a man over fifty, and well experienced at the time of Alexander's invasion, he was made satrap of Phrygia in 333 B.C., and remained in charge of it instead of accompanying the king's campaign. This, while it made him less familiar with Alexander's ideas, made him also an established ruler at the breaking up of the empire. He was lord of Phrygia, in fact of central Asia Minor, for over thirty years. He tried hard to found a great kingdom for himself, if possible as great as Alexander's; if not, one which should hand down his glory to posterity, and he very nearly succeeded; but for the inaccessibility of Egypt and the cautious defensive policy of its king, but for the great strategic ability of Lysimachus, the campaign of Ipsus might have resulted in leaving his son Demetrius master of the world. His rudeness and jocularity, which gave rise to fables of his low origin, were perpetuated in many anecdotes. Not so certain to my mind are his love and patronage of letters. We know that he attached to himself, after the death of Eumenes, the historian Hieronymus of Cardia, who told his history with judicious if not with judicial impartiality. But when we hear of all manner of Greek artists being assembled at his new capital, Antigoneia on the Orontes, we may suspect the influence of his son Demetrius.

For this father and son, among all the earlier Diadochi, stand alone in their loving and intimate union. The son of Antipater, as we have seen, was postponed by his father to a stranger, and only given the second place in the management of the empire; the eldest son of Ptolemy was disinherited and let loose on the world to do terrible mischief; the eldest son of Lysimachus, Agathocles, a worthy and able prince, was even assassinated by his father's

[1] ὁ τὰς λόγχας ἐσθίων is the jibing description of Demosthenes by his foes.

orders. It was no wonder then that the historians noted how Demetrius came in from hunting armed, and went straight into the king's presence without fear or suspicion on either side. The rarity of such relations between father and son are a notable sign of the times.

Yet Antigonus belongs to the old generation. In smaller matters, such as the careful keeping of journals of his proceedings, and his attention to omens before battle, we are reminded that he was imitating Alexander. His assumption of the title *king* in a famous officially-prepared scene [1] shows his ambition. He was clear-sighted enough to see the hopelessness of restoring the old dynasty, and that royalty was the form of government for the future; but he had no fresh ideas, no fruitful policy to act as a cement of the great kingdom he had conquered, and so his great labours resulted in nothing but confusion.

The one permanent result, which the rule of Antigonus and after him of Lysimachus produced upon Asia Minor, was the refounding of famous old cities, which had been scattered into villages since the Lydian or Persian conquest. Antigonus restored Smyrna, Lysimachus restored Ephesos, the latter not without some high-handed proceedings. This is told us in the first chapter of Strabo's fourteenth book.

There is, moreover, a most interesting inscription preserved [2] containing a rescript of King Antigonus concerning the amalgamation (*συνοικισμός*) of Teos and Lebedos, with directions about the accommodating of the lesser population (Lebedos) by the greater, the adopting of the laws of Kos, and many other details. The towns are to have perfect liberty to make all their arrangements, but these must be

[1] Plut. *Demetr.* 18.
[2] Cf. Dittenberger's *Sylloge* i. 126.

sent up and sanctioned by him, and he will punish all that disobey him. When I said just now that the labour of Antigonus resulted in nothing but confusion, I should perhaps have made more allowance for this organising of great towns out of the smaller towns or villages. These reconstituted cities became in many cases most prosperous, and were the leading feature in Asia, as opposed to Greece, in the later days of Hellenism.

PTOLEMY stands next in age, being about twelve years older than his king, and among his early friends. He entered upon the great period of conquest at an age when a man may yet have preserved youth enough to adopt new ideas, and he succeeded in such a way that his life and work stand apart, and will require a separate chapter.[1]

LYSIMACHUS was probably a little younger in years, and yet he belongs distinctly to the older Diadochi in character—a splendid soldier, full of energy and resource, recovering after defeat, ambitious too of power, and fond of royal state. Yet though he at one time, after long and various struggles, obtained a great kingdom, and was master of all the western empire, he made no impression on his age. We hear that Alexander told off Lysimachus, the Acarnanian, his old tutor, to learn the wisdom of the Brachmans. This must have been a very different Lysimachus, for the Thracian king is said to have expelled philosophers from his dominions. Was this owing to the court experiences of his earlier years? He was a great soldier. For a whole year he baffled the superior force of Antigonus by occupying fortified lines, and retreating safely from them just as they were about to be stormed. Even Pyrrhus, the best tactician of the younger generation, was no match for

[1] I have treated of this king and of his successors in a separate volume, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*.

him, and could not hold Macedonia for one campaign against him.[1] Thus he included in his power Macedonia, Thrace, with its important coast cities, and a great part of Asia Minor, in fact, a kingdom second to none for commercial activity and for the elements of culture, yet he did nothing to cement it beyond murdering some local tyrants, and founding, like all the Diadochi, cities after his own and his queen's name on the model of Alexander. He seems to have held and fortified Lemnos, and Strabo tells us he renamed Ephesus after his wife Arsinoe. But there are evidences that he acted with harshness and little regard for the feelings of his free subjects. Possibly Arsinoe in Aetolia was his foundation, and also the temple in Samothrace dedicated by Arsinoe. The younger generation, especially Demetrius, hated him, and looked on him as vulgar, stingy, and mean. His family quarrels, in consequence of repeated marriages with ambitious princesses, brought him first to the crime of murdering his ablest son, and then to the misfortune of losing his kingdom.[2] So unpopular was his reign that when Seleucus came to avenge the children and subjects of the old man the kingdom

[1] There is a story told (Plut. *Demetr.* 27) of his showing the marks left on him by a lion, to which he was thrown by Alexander's orders. When I read in Plutarch (*Alex.* 41) that Alexander wrote to Peukestas, who was wounded by a bear, reproving him for not letting him know, and asking whether any of his fellow-sportsmen were to blame from cowardice, that he might punish them, I am disposed to think that Lysimachus's fight with the lion was owing to some affair of this kind, when he was obliged to vindicate himself against a charge of leaving a fellow-sportsman in danger. Any more serious charge, such as treason, against him would surely have been known to the historians. Great cruelty in Lysimachus is implied by Plutarch's story, *de exilio* 16: 'When the king exhibited Telesphorus in a cage with his eyes put out, his ears and nose cut off, his tongue cut off, and said: thus I treat those that injure me ——' here the text breaks off.

[2] Cf. the summary of his history in Pausanias i. 10.

melted from him, and he fell, like Antigonus, on the field of battle at Korupedion, near the Hellespont.

These days were days of perpetual war and tumult, when military ability was sure to bring its reward, and place a man some day in the first rank, but they were also days of the seething and reconstructing of society, when to conquer in battle was only the first step in the problem, and the warrior, if not an able and progressive politician, was sure to lose what he had acquired.

These qualities could only be found in men who were young in ideas as well as in years. Such was Ptolemy, and such was SELEUCUS, whose life would well deserve a chapter, like that of Ptolemy, if we had the necessary information. But we only know of the great results he attained, of the strong affection he inspired, of the permanent dynasty he founded under enormous difficulties. Thus he must either have been far the ablest of the Diadochi, or he must have moulded his mind more thoroughly than the rest in the ideas of his playmate and fellow in arms, Alexander. For he was the youngest of all the original Diadochi, and probably very little older than the king. He had first distinguished himself in the great battle on the Hydaspes, and was already so prominent at Babylon that he was given the daughter of Spitamenes of Sogdiana—a great figure in the eastern provinces—to wife. Appointed at the first division of the empire by Perdikkas to be second in command (Chiliarch), he was at the second division, at Triparadeisus (321 B.C.), made satrap of Babylon. Here he settled himself, and was so occupied with the consolidation of his power that we hardly hear of him till Antigonus came back from the south-east provinces, after conquering Eumenes, with such power and pretensions that Seleucus fled for his life, and was an exile with Ptolemy in Egypt (316 B.C.).

But as soon as the Egyptian's successes in Phoenicia permitted it, Ptolemy sent back his visitor, who had helped him vigorously in his naval campaigns, to raise the east against the waxing power of his threatening neighbour Antigonus. So popular was Seleucus in his satrapy, that without an army he at once recovered it, and from that time to his death was practically lord of the East.

It is plain that his main interests lay in that direction.[1] These provinces of the empire had never been really conquered. Even Alexander had only changed their suzerain relations. He left the local chiefs and satraps their power. Naturally such of his successors as Perdikkas and Antigonus, who obtained only temporary control, could do no more. Hence the introduction of Macedonian or Greek influence into these remote provinces was rather a matter of policy than of coercion. And this was evidently Seleucus's talent. He, like Antigonus, stood in the best relations to his son, as is proved by the curious story of his ceding him his young wife, Stratonike, the sister of Demetrius, with whom the youth (though she was his step-mother) fell madly in love; he also showed delicate consideration for Demetrius, when he at last got that firebrand into his power. He had had various struggles with him and his father. In one raid (312 B.C.), when the king was occupied in the far East, Demetrius had even taken and plundered Babylon, his capital, and committed all manner of insolent outrages. Chandragupta, the Indian king who was curtailing the Macedonian empire in the East, was also induced to make such peace and alliance that if Seleucus

[1] However, a dedicatory inscription by him and his wife Stratonike, found at Delos, proves that he did not neglect the amenities to the Greeks practised by every really Hellenistic sovran. Cf. the text in *BCH* xii. 420.

lost some provinces, the friendship and the enormous gifts of the Indian more than made up the loss. With the 480 elephants of Chandragupta he crushed the force of Antigonus at Ipsus. We see in him no strong personal feeling save horror at Lysimachus's offer of large bribes (2000 talents) if he would 'remove' Demetrius. This he considered the proposal of a scoundrel and a barbarian (*μιαρὸν καὶ βάρβαρον*). Indeed, Seleucus and Ptolemy appear to me characters not only different from the old generals we have described, but even more modern than the knight-errants of the second generation, Demetrius and Pyrrhus, who still dreamt of rivalling Alexander.

Seleucus is quite an *Epigonos*[1] in character. We know that he was understood and beloved by the orientals as much and probably more than Peukestas, who adopted their dress and language. He had wives from Sogdiana and India, as well as from Macedonia and Greece. And yet there seems in all that he does Greek culture and refinement. He indeed understood how to marry Europe and Asia, and succeeded in no small degree.[2] But the natural difficulties in his way were enormous. Not only were the races under his sway exceedingly diverse in language, manners, and religion, but the geographical disposition of his provinces made it almost impossible for one man to defend them against energetic hostility on the frontiers. And this arose not from the size of the empire, but from the fact that it stretched across three of the great lines of separation nature has made in the Asian continent. First we have the

[1] The second generation of Alexander's successors is usually distinguished by this name.

[2] Mommsen (*RG* v. 348) notices particularly how the first Seleucus deferred to the Magi in the choice and consecration and site of Seleucia on the Tigris, his great Greek city in Mesopotamia.

Taurus range, secondly the desert of Thapsus, protecting the crossing of the Euphrates—an obstacle which the Romans in after days were never able permanently to overcome. Then comes the great desert of Persia, which compels the highroad to go far round by the Parthian Gates, or, still worse, by the burning sands of Gedrosia and the sea. We know how even Alexander suffered in the snows of the Indian Caucasus (Hindukush), and again in the tropical sands of Gedrosia. This it was which made Seleucus, when the affair of his new wife's transfer was completed, send off the young couple to be rulers of the 'upper' provinces. Antiochus I. was accordingly established in this office, and though he commanded Seleucus's cavalry at Ipsus, and was defeated by his future brother-in-law, his maturer years, up to Seleucus's death, were spent in the far East.[1] But no efforts could weld the lands this side the Euphrates with the wild mountains of Media and Parthia. In the former were pliant, mostly Semitic, nationalities, accustomed to absolute monarchy, and caring little about changes of masters or even of government if their material interests were secure; in the latter, free tribes dwelling in pasture and mountain, accustomed to be led by warrior chiefs, but of that Aryan type which we meet again in the chivalrous barons of the Middle Ages.[2]

But no outlying country, not even Egypt with its careful ruler, was induced to adopt Hellenic culture so thoroughly or at least so easily as Syria. There seem to be no resisting features in any of the populations excepting the Jews; and how completely even they were impregnated with Hellenism is shown by the history of the Septuagint translation, and

[1] Cf. Strabo xi. 10.

[2] The epic of the Shah-name shows us how reasonable is this comparison.

still more of the completely Greek documents of the New Testament. But I am anticipating what belongs to much later chapters in this work. Here we are concerned with the character of Seleucus, who fortunately was the youngest of the Diadochi, and with that of Ptolemy, the wisest—the only Successors who regarded war as an evil, and military glory as only the prelude to a safe and honourable peace. In his youthful intercourse with the great conqueror, in his precious four years' exile with his politic and successful cousin the King of Egypt, Seleucus had learned the lessons of the newer time, and contributed largely to the great age of cosmopolitan culture which prepared the world for the unity and peace of the Roman Empire.

CHAPTER IV

THE YOUNGER GENERATION OF DIADOCHI, AND THE PRINCESSES OF THEIR DAY

BEFORE we enter on these larger topics there remain for us some notable figures in the epoch of confusion, which belong to the newer generation, and yet have not abandoned the impossible ideal set them by Alexander—men brought up not in the camp or in campaigns, but in more or less home splendour, accustomed to the pomp of court and to culture, and eminently the precursors of the new cosmopolitanism. We select here the three greatest, who made no small stir even in the stormy age which begat them—Demetrius, Pyrrhus, and Casander. Though Casander was much the oldest of them, I shall put him last, for he seems to me to have understood the coming order of things far better than his more brilliant rivals. These *Epigoni* were in many respects nearer to Alexander in character and aims than any of the older Diadochi. They had that knight-errant quality in them which, in Alexander, fascinated continents and centuries of men. Cowardice is so universal in our race, and fear makes so large a part of the misery of human life, that any man whose acts show him to be totally devoid of them will always be worshipped as a hero even if he displays this recklessness in the destruction of his fellows. In Alexander

it was almost a craving to incur danger; if he was not charging at the head of his cavalry, he was occupied in hand-to-hand conflicts with wild beasts; these were the pleasures for which he underwent endless mental and bodily toil.

There is no doubt that PYRRHUS, the King of Epirus, more properly of the Molossians, had this temper, so that most of Alexander's veterans who met him saw in him the nearest approach to the great conqueror. He was essentially, too, a student of war. His only writing was on tactics. But as the younger Antigonus (Gonatas) used to say, he was a lucky player who did not know how to make use of his good throws. He won battles and lost campaigns; he won provinces and lost kingdoms; he gained the highest reputation of his age, and left nothing behind him—a fulgent meteor flashing across the sky, and showing but a momentary track of its brilliant path. He is far the best known of the Diadochi to the modern student, for he passes into the domain of Roman history, and his campaigns and parleys with the great Republic have been made the occasion of glorifying Roman purity and morals.

But I will not spend time over his wars, which are related for schoolboys in their manuals, so far as they relate to Italy. The story of his life in Plutarch is more than usually picturesque. His escape when an infant from murderous pursuit, the delay of his protectors at the swollen river, the difficulties of shouting across the water for help, and the danger of the passage, then the unconscious appeal for mercy to an unwilling host—all this is so touching as to produce a narrative not equalled in Greek history since Herodotus's narrative of the escape of the infant Cypselus.[1] His Molossians appear to have had that unsteady character

[1] Plut. *Pyrrhus* 2, 3. Herod. v. 92, and my *Social Life in Greece* p. 164.

which appears all through the history of Epirus. Accustomed as they were to kings, they seem always ready to take up with a new ruler. Thus a temporary absence of Pyrrhus, when a youth of sixteen, lost him a second time his royal rights. But his exile was spent in great wars and at splendid courts, and this it was, more than his boasted heroic descent from Hellenic ancestors, which gave him the kingly manners and the culture which so impressed the Romans.

He was born after Alexander's death (about 318 B.C.), and therefore had only second-hand accounts of the great ideal of the age. But he lived in intimacy with his brother-in-law Demetrius, the most striking man of the day; he took part in the great battle of the kings (Ipsus), and then went as a voluntary hostage for Demetrius to Egypt, where old Ptolemy was writing his memoirs of Alexander. So he learned to imitate the smaller points of the conqueror; he had prophetic dreams before his battles; he charged with his cavalry, though all the while keeping his head and directing the movements; when he recovered his kingdom he kept diaries, like Alexander; he married many wives, all of them princesses; nay, at Alexandria when a youth he gained the favour of the reigning queen, who gave him, a homeless prince, her daughter Antigone in marriage. But he was no ladies' man, like Demetrius; he was too fierce-looking to be called beautiful, and his closely set teeth were so remarkable as to produce the legend that each row was a solid bone. He was also said to cure spleen (liver?) diseases, by sacrificing a cock for the patient, and chafing his liver with his right foot. In fact, his great toe had such divine virtue that, like Shelley's heart, it refused to burn on the funeral pyre.

The point of interest to us in his character is to see how completely this Molossian had adopted Hellenic, or rather

Hellenistic, culture, and taken his place among that large society of kings who lived together in hostile peace and friendly war, always foes and never enemies, all connected by marriage and opposed in interests, a society more like that of the Norman barons in Southern Europe than anything which the world has seen before or since. His prime minister, the Thessalian Cineas, has been made famous by his missions to Rome—an orator, a Greek, a man 'who had heard Demosthenes,' and therefore, like a man 'who followed Alexander,' far superior to his rivals. This love of looking back to great models is one of the most distinctive features in an age which, in politics and morals, had broken absolutely with the past. The authenticity of those politenesses between Cineas and the senate, of which Plutarch and the world have made such capital, cannot but be suspicious; how could a body of Romans of that day have understood Greek? and Cineas of course knew no Latin. We hear of no interpreter, and yet through some such person, more probably some Samnite or Apulian with a Greek mother, rather than a Roman senator, all the negotiations must have been carried on.

Nevertheless the general character of the war can hardly have been distorted. The Romans recognised in Pyrrhus a man civilised beyond the level of Italy, a brave captain, and an honourable foe. And he, a mere soldier of fortune, seeking conquest as a means to other conquests, and regarding nothing but his own glory, had culture deep enough to carry on the struggle like a gentleman, and even to recognise the moral depth and weight of the Roman character. Here he found a philosophy better than the Stoic, for it was the philosophy of a nation, shown in actual life, and Pyrrhus, after his chequered career in the Two Sicilies, felt clearly that here lay the power which was the

real danger to eastern Hellenism. He called to his allies and rivals to come to his aid, but in vain. When his expedition was first proposed, it had been their common interest to get this knight-errant out of their way, and so we have the spectacle, impossible at any other age, of three kings—Ptolemy Keraunus who had seized Macedon, his brother Philadelphus of Egypt, and Antiochus of Asia, who were at war one with the other, all contributing men, horses, elephants, and treasure, to get rid of this outsider, on whom no one could count. Now that he had found out and told them the real danger, they were too selfish or too busy to help him. Ptolemy Keraunus indeed was dead, killed by the Galatae, and Antigonus Gonatas, a man of a new age and of new ideas, had recovered the kingdom of Macedon. So Pyrrhus came home in disgust, set upon Antigonus, reconquered Macedonia, and then, after one more of the unsuccessful attempts on Sparta, went to die by the hand of an old woman in the streets of Argos (272 B.C.).[1] But though all his acts left no trace on the kingdoms of Hellenistic peoples, he had afforded one more specimen of the mock-Alexander type, whose life was war, and whose delight was in danger; whose court also spread abroad ideas of luxury and refinement, whose treatment even of his foes refined and softened the manners of the age, and whose palace at Ambracia showed the rude Epirotes how the bravery of the hardiest mountaineer could be combined with the silken hangings and purple carpets of the oriental monarch.

We have in DEMETRIUS the Besieger (Poliorketes) a very

[1] The manner of his death is unanimously reported by all our authorities. They differ as to whether he was at the wall or inside the town. Cf. Droysen's *Hellenismus* iii. 218, where the evidence is fully discussed.

kindred and yet very dissimilar character. Born in 337, he was nearly twenty years older than Pyrrhus, but he died only nine years before him, and we can hardly say that he had attained a trace of the soberness or leisure of age. His life is a perfect storm of youthful enjoyment and adventure. Brought up all his youth in the Phrygian court of Antigonus, which with all the old man's rudeness of manner was not wanting in splendour; educated as Alexander had been, to the topmost level of Hellenism; endowed with such beauty that no sculptor or painter was ever able adequately to reproduce it, Demetrius was, like all his rivals, bred and trained carefully in the art of war. He was an excellent general and admiral, most famous in his military engineering, from which he got his title. 'With his size of body and his beauty,' says Diodorus,[1] 'he showed such heroic dignity that strangers who came and saw comeliness adorned with the pre-eminence of a king, marvelled and followed him as he went abroad, for the very sight's sake. In mind too he was exalted and magnificent, looking down not merely upon the common people but upon those in authority. And, most remarkable of all, whereas in time of peace he spent his time in drinking and in banquets with dance and revel, seeking, in short, to emulate the reign of Dionysus, once fabled among men; in time of war he was active and abstemious, outrivalling his companions in toil alike of mind and body. In his time the mightiest weapons were forged, and machines of every kind were devised, far surpassing those which had been in use among other peoples.' But he did not, like Pyrrhus, make the warrior side of Alexander the ideal of his life. To him battles were not an end, but a means to that glory which would give him universal dominion over the minds of men and the hearts of women. This

[1] xx. 92.

latter passion was, however, always crossing his better interests, and the variety of his amours was not so much a scandal as a wonder to the people of the time.

Here he fell far below his model, for Alexander's mind had always been occupied with greater things, and his body with such hard work that distractions of this kind laid no hold upon him. Still, if Pyrrhus sought to follow in the steps of Alexander by pure strategy, and became such a master that the theorists said he surpassed his teacher in that respect, Demetrius took a more imaginative view, and felt that it was not by arms but by his personality that Alexander had achieved his greatest successes. His strength and beauty were not inferior to Alexander's; he took care that his culture should be not less; his talents were undoubted; but the spontaneity of genius was not there. However great a master of rhetoric Aristotle may have been, Alexander, to judge from his manifesto to Darius after the battle of Issus (Arrian ii. 14), was no master of the Greek style even of that age. The document is curiously clumsy and badly composed. But we cannot say that Demetrius, even in his mature life, had learned to speak as he ought. In one of his last speeches to the Athenians (about 295 B.C.) we are told that he *barbarised* (ἐβαρβάρισε), and that one of the Attic audience who was close by corrected him. Plutarch, led, no doubt, by the wording of his sources, constantly speaks of the theatrical (the tragic) style of his appearance and of his acts. He was always posing as a great man, and if he did not spend the evening boasting of his achievements, as Alexander was said to have done, men must have felt that he thought over them all the more.

Yet even he had not a few brilliant conquests to boast of. He had defeated the most successful of all the Diadochi, Ptolemy, both by sea and land; princesses vied for his hand,

and were even content with his passing favours; artists and philosophers opened to him the wealth of their stores. So we can imagine that when his wily old father sent him to 'free Athens,' the youth landed in the Peiraeus with splendid hopes, and regarded himself as the coming leader in a really Hellenic empire, with real culture and refinement at its capital. We are not told how his illusions must have been dissipated by the indecent flatteries of the restored democracy. The formal decrees of Stratocles[1] declaring him and his father kings, then gods, and crawling in the dust before him with their new liberty, must indeed have shown him that the days of this kind of polity were gone, and that Hellenism could not be reconstructed at Athens. We hear not a word of his visits to the philosophers' schools at Athens, or how far he may have been able to overcome the moral indignation of Zeno, of Epicurus, or of Xenocrates. For these men were even then the leaders of the best classes at Athens. But to this curious condition of Athens we shall return when our portraits of the princes are completed. It was no doubt with a feeling of disgust and contempt that he turned to ribald and sensual enjoyments, and gave way to a great debauch, in which he violated all the sanctities of the Acropolis, brought the foul Lamia to sup with Athene in the Parthenon, and lived like the most abandoned oriental despot in the city which he had restored to its liberty.

But from this time onward we see in Demetrius a cynical and selfish turn as regards the ruling over men. When he became King of Macedonia he was noted for a pompous and discourteous manner to his subjects. He had learned to treat ordinary mortals with contempt. The Athenians, who had once worshipped him as a god, would

[1] Plut. *Demetr.* 10-12, to be cited presently.

not admit him as an exile. Thus he came more and more to use masses of men as mere materials to further conquest, and not as intelligent and moral beings to be swayed by attachment. He became, no less than Pyrrhus, the world's scourge.

And yet there was about him something bright which could not be corroded; there was a vein of gold beneath the silver and the dross. His affection for his father was so strong and tender as to excite the wonder of the age and the constant boasting of the old man; not less remarkable is the devotion of his noble wife Phila, daughter of Antipater, who stood by him in all his vagaries and vicissitudes, and poisoned herself when she thought his ruin inevitable. The same undying love is seen in her son Antigonus, afterwards the wise and enlightened ruler of Macedonia and Greece, who offered his liberty and even his life to recover his ruined and reckless father. Nor do his family stand alone in this feeling; we hear that when he was captive many cities and despots petitioned Seleucus for his release, and against them Lysimachus stood alone, in his anxious entreaties and traitorous offers to have the great firebrand kept from again bringing the world into anxiety and disorder. These facts show how real a charm there must have been about the man, far beyond that engendered by chivalry and generosity in war, or even that somewhat affected veneration for art which comes out in the parley with the Rhodians during the great siege about the painting by Protogenes, which, after seven years of the artist's labour, had been left unfinished in the suburbs. Demetrius assured them he would rather burn his father's statues than harm such a work.[1]

To make the portraits of this age complete, we have still before us the figure of CASANDER of Macedon, the son

[1] Plut. *Demetr.* 22. Cf. the brilliant sketch of Demetrius by von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff in his *Antigonos von Karystos.*

of Antipater, the life-long opponent first of the royal family, then of Demetrius, of Pyrrhus, of Ptolemy when he attempted aggression, most of all of Greek democracy. Casander was nearly of the same age as Alexander, but was probably despised or disliked by him, and not taken to Asia. This may have been in consequence of his delicate health, for we hear that he was no sportsman, and had to sit among the children at dinner up to mature age, they say up to thirty-five, because he had never killed his wild boar. Such were the habits of the Macedonian country gentry. This defect no doubt made him despised by Alexander, and whatever was the cause, he showed all through his after life the most determined hostility to the Great King. His temper was said to be violent, his obstinacy remarkable, but of this we have no evidence beyond his acts. He was no mere soldier, such as I conceive his father to have been, and was trained in all the wisdom of the Greeks. Euhemerus of Messene preached to him his Rationalism. Homer was his special favourite, and here only he imitated Alexander in having with him always a special copy, and so knowing most of the poet by heart. The competence of his teachers as to learning may be perhaps inferred from the curious notices of the pedantry of his brother Alexarchus, who built himself a city, Uranopolis, on Mount Athos, and adopted a strange jargon on some peculiar principles of derivation. Athenaeus quotes a letter he wrote,[1] and adds that it would take the Theban

[1] iii. 98 d Ἀλέξαρχος ὁ μάρμων πρόμοις γαθεῖν. τοὺς ἠλιοκρεῖς οἰῶν οἶδα λιποῦσα θεωτῶν ἔργων κρατήτορας μορσίμῳ τύχᾳ κεκιρωμένας θεοῦ πόγαις χυτλώσαντες αὐτοὺς καὶ φύλακας ὀριγενεῖς. Strabo (vii. frag. 35) describes this city apparently on the high summit of Athos, 30 stadia in circumference. He says the sun rose on the mountain, and people were already ploughing the fields above, before the cocks began to crow in the valley beneath. He does not state, but implies, that the town was high on the ridge of the peninsula.

Sphinx to interpret it. I have already told how he got his head banged against the wall, and we may be sure his haughty temper determined him to avenge the insult in blood. Fortune gave him only too many opportunities. It is clear that he did not get on well with his father, who appointed him only Chiliarch, or second in command, and gave the regency to Polyperchon, warning both on his deathbed on no account to let the royal princesses, especially the furious queen-mother, seize the reins of power. We can imagine Casander promising faithfully to carry out these directions, adding silently the vow that it should apply no less to the princes.

Not brooking to be second, and escaping under the pretence of a great hunt into Thrace and to Asia, he joined Antigonus, and set himself to regain Greece and Macedon, where he had many adherents among the local governors, from the new regent and the royal family. He then adopted openly the policy from which he never swerved, that of independent sovranties, as opposed to that of the royal house of Alexander. The complications of his after life, his constant wars in Greece, Macedonia, and Epirus, are among the most perplexing portions of this intricate history. In the face of all the other Diadochi, Antigonus, Demetrius, Ptolemy, and, first of all, Polyperchon, who kept proclaiming the liberty of the Greeks, he determined to rule them by oligarchs and by garrisons; and in this policy, inherited from Antipater, he in the main succeeded. In a special chapter on the state of Greece we shall again treat of this matter at length. The domestic quarrels of the royal house introduced his long-conceived policy of its destruction. The bold and daring princess Eurydike, now married to the silly Philip Arridaeus, called on him to return with her from Asia to Macedon and assert her husband's rights. Of course she was opposed by Olympias, who kept in her charge

Roxane and the infant Alexander, and defended them with furious jealousy. In the war for the succession which ensued Olympias got the upper hand, and not only put to death her rivals at once, but committed such odious excesses in punishing their adherents that the Macedonians were disgusted, and went over to Casander. She was not saved by her regent Polyperchon, and was condemned to death by the Macedonians with some encouragement from Casander.

From this time on he was practically king of Macedon, having in his charge Roxane and her son, whom he gradually secluded, imprisoned, and then made away with—a cruel and cold-blooded murder planned with deliberation, and carried out with such prudence as to avoid any public manifestation of sympathy with the unfortunate prince. The children in the Tower had no sadder fate than this boy—born to the heritage of the world, kept in strange pomp, then in obscurity, then in confinement, till poison comes to conclude a life of hopeless misery. Not a single trait or anecdote has survived to tell us of his person or character. The situation alone makes him a strangely tragic figure.[1]

There remained only the bastard Herakles, son of Barsine the widow of Memnon, whom Polyperchon adopted to sustain his failing position as regent. But with his merciless logic Casander bribed his rival to destroy him.[2] The wars and enmities of these satraps were all secondary to their interests. They all understood one another well, and fought with the most cynical good humour and friendliness. So the whole house of Alexander was destroyed by the man

[1] Cf. Aurel. Vict. *Caes.* 28 on the younger Philip, who never smiled, and the remarks of Duruy *History of Rome* vi. 349. The statue of him now at Cairo, if it indeed be such, is purely conventional. Cf. my *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 38.

[2] Cf. the details in Plutarch *de vit. pud.* 4.

whom he probably regarded as an ill-conditioned milksop, not worth using in his campaigns.

This personal hostility showed itself in the policy of Casander, no less than in his revenge. We see no trace of his adopting Asiatic features in his kingdom; he even seems to avoid any claim to rule in Asia, unless it be to hamper Ptolemy by holding Greek cities in Caria. The monarchy he sought to found was essentially an European monarchy, based on the supremacy of Macedon and the enforced support of Greece. He was not a great general, and yet by his superior consistency he held his ground even against Demetrius, who, with all his splendour and his liberation of the Greeks, was unable to oust Casander from his kingdom. He was no doubt in serious danger just before the battle of Ipsus, but the great events pending in Asia caused both combatants to agree in suspending the war in Europe, and in sending their forces to Asia. Casander, with all his various activity, had not the constitution of the hardy old race; he died of lingering disease at the age of fifty-seven, and his children seem to have inherited his bodily weaknesses with the worst side of his character. They were murdered either one by the other or by Demetrius, and so the monarchy of Casander disappeared, to be resuscitated after many momentous struggles by his sister's and Demetrius's son, Antigonus.

Casander's character is certainly one of the clearest, hardest, and most consistent among the Diadochi. What he lacked in genius he made up in determination. His record as murderer of the house of Alexander has left a dark stain upon his memory; but without palliating it, we may remark that there was not one of his rivals who would not have done the same thing, excepting Eumenes. The son of Alexander must soon have dispossessed his regents,

and there was not one of the satraps who had the smallest intention of resigning sovran power.

We have now completed our sketch of the various princes who ruled the Eastern world in the throes which gave birth to Hellenism. It is a period when there were so many wars and rumours of wars that the commander and the army occupy public attention, to the exclusion of civil life and domestic events. But the generals were like the mediaeval barons, keeping high state, and fastidious about ceremony. Thus their courts formed a sort of society like the courts of the barons, where etiquette was observed, and where other princes, even though rivals and enemies, were treated with far more consideration than subjects. The change in public temper is shown by nothing better than by the assumption of the title king (*βασιλεύς*), a title once strange and disgusting to the Hellenic world, and regarded as belonging peculiarly to the great hereditary ruler of Eastern barbarians. Yet now we find the Athenians only anticipating the tide of public opinion when, in the extravagance of their flattery, they hailed their deliverers, Antigonus and Demetrius, as kings. They can hardly have felt serious in this, and their unconscious expression of the wants of the age was probably loathed by the more reputable among them. A year after (306 B.C.), all the great satraps, Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleucus, formally assume the name, latest of them Casander, as if he hesitated to adopt the title of those whom he had murdered. For the disappearance of the last member of Alexander's house, Herakles (309 B.C.), removed the only sentimental objection to such a step. From henceforth each of the Diadochi held his possessions as lawful conquest (*δορίκτητον*), and no older title was ever after demanded or asserted. The

partition of the empire at Triparadeisus was assumed to be the starting-point of political history.[1]

But I must return from history to social life, which is my direct subject. My sketch of the princes and courts of the Diadochi would indeed be incomplete if I did not add something concerning the princesses who play so prominent a part in the great struggle. We are no longer among those women who may have held it excellence to be never mentioned among men for good or for evil, but among haughty peeresses, with royal rights and property of their own, who can make harangues, ride at the head of their troops, and make offers of marriage to men.

Philip had led the fashion of marrying many wives; we hear of seven more or less regular marriages; of his wives, the gloomy and violent Olympias was the chief, and plays a great figure in history. She would not brook any rival,[2] and after Philip's death, which many supposed her to have

[1] The opening verses of *First Maccabees* express the views taken of Alexander and his successors by oriental nations—'And it came to pass after that Alexander the son of Philip, the Macedonian, had smitten Darius the king of the Medes and Persians, that he ruled in his stead, being already king over Greece. And he made many wars, and conquered many strong places, and slew the kings of the earth, and passed through to the ends of the earth, and took spoil of many nations, and the earth was quiet before him. And he was exalted, and his heart was lifted up. And he gathered a very strong army together, and ruled over lands and nations and tyrants, and they paid him tribute. And after these things he fell upon his couch, and knew that he was dying. And he called his pages (παῖδας) of renown that were brought up with him from youth, and divided unto them his kingdom while he was yet alive. And his pages prevailed each in his own place. And they all put crowns upon them after he was dead, and their sons after them for many years, and evils were multiplied in the earth.'

[2] Still, the two anecdotes told of her by Plutarch (*coniug. praecepta* 23-24) represent her as a humane and sensible person. He says Olympias was not her proper name (*de Pyth. orac.* 14) but Polyxena, or Myrtile, and that she was also called Stratonike.

contrived, she put to death with tortures the last wife, Cleopatra, and her infant son. From that time onward she lived all through her son's life, and for some years afterward, claiming a queenly power in Macedon, quarrelling bitterly with old Antipater, and putting to death, whenever she could, her rivals for power. She appears to have taken up with great loyalty Roxane, the legitimate wife of Alexander, and his infant son, and there is something tragic in her struggles to maintain their cause against the cold and cruel Casander. She retained to the last, as Alexander's mother, such an influence over the Macedonian soldiers that they would only slay her after a mock trial, and though she had murdered and even tortured many, she had the virtue of a savage, and died with firmness and dignity. According to the story told by Diodorus, the trial was held in her absence, and she was condemned by the relatives of those she had put to death while she had command of Macedonia in her war with Casander. The latter then sent her secret word to fly, and had a ship ready, that she might be murdered on the way. But she replied that she would never fly, but stand her trial before all the Macedonians. This Casander was afraid to risk, on account of the great position she held in public estimation; and when he sent 200 men to slay her, she came out to meet them in royal apparel, leaning on two of her ladies. Whereupon they were ashamed and went off. Then Casander again appealed to the relatives of her victims, who killed her with stones. She died smoothing her grey hairs, and arranging her robes decently as she fell.

So then, in spite of her furious temper and her many bloodthirsty acts, this woman was not only a real queen, but had attained to 'such divinity [as] doth hedge a king.' We hear nothing of her culture, except that she was given

to Orphic and Bacchic mysteries, and that she wearied Alexander with constant letters. That these letters were regarded as her own private writing, appears from an anecdote told by Plutarch,[1] that the Athenians, at war with her husband Philip, captured his messengers, and read all the other despatches, but would not open the letter from Olympias, which they sent back to him sealed just as it was. This politeness implies that it was regarded as her own. Whether she wrote in Greek or Macedonian is a question hard to answer. But being a native Illyrian, and therefore not speaking Macedonian as a mother tongue, she probably used Greek, as all the petty princes in Germany used French, employing a very trustworthy private secretary, who carried on for her those many secret and open correspondences which she held with her son, and afterwards with Perdikkas, Eumenes, Polyperchon, and with cities such as Athens.

Philip had three daughters: Cleopatra, by Olympias, and therefore full sister to the great Alexander; Kynane, by an Illyrian princess; and Thessalonike, married to Casander, who gave her name to the town he built[2] which became famous in history, and which still survives (*Thes*-Salonica). She was murdered by one of his sons. But though her name has not perished we know nothing of her character, nor does she play the prominent part of her half-sisters. Of these, Cleopatra married her uncle, the Epirote (Molossian) Alexander, Olympias's brother, who, while his greater namesake was conquering the East, essayed to subdue the West; and went by invitation of the cities of Magna Graecia to defend them against the mountaineers of

[1] *Demetr.* 22.

[2] Cf. Dionys. Hal. i. 40. It was a *συνοικισμός* of neighbouring towns, like most of these Hellenistic foundations.

the Abruzzi, who were gradually destroying the Hellenic power in Italy. But his ambition reached too far for the Italiot Greeks; he was murdered and his army scattered (about 331 B.C.).

So the young widow was left a princess, like her aunt Olympias, both of Epirus and of Macedonia. Though they not unfrequently quarrelled, their interests were generally at one, and the young queen, as soon as Alexander, her brother, was also dead, sought to make good her pretensions to the kingdom. She was the most legitimate of all the pretenders, so long as the infant son of Queen Roxane was not grown up; and her claims were so well recognised, that she had the choice of all the husbands in the world. She secretly chose the gallant Leonnatus, probably from personal liking; and he came at once at her proposal, but was killed in helping Antipater before Lamia. Then she was offered by her aunt to Perdikkas, when he became regent. He accepted, promising to repudiate the daughter of Antipater, who had been sent to him. But he, again, was killed in his attack on Egypt. If Eumenes had been victorious, he would doubtless have married her. She resided in Sardis for fifteen years, in royal state, and when accused of treason and sedition by old Antipater, who was returning from Triparadeisus as regent, defended herself with such spirit publicly before the Macedonians that the general thought it best to leave her alone. At last she found herself in the power of Antigonus at Sardis, and when over fifty proposed to escape to Egypt and marry Ptolemy, who had already at least two wives and grown-up children. She was murdered by order of Antigonus, so that even then, in the zenith of his power (308 B.C.), he feared the influence which a royal marriage with this long-exiled queen would give to his rival.

She has the same bold independent character as Olympias,

and was certainly educated as the sister of Alexander, not secluded like a Greek girl. Still, I believe that, though she spoke Greek perfectly, she must have made her defence to the soldiers at Sardis in Macedonian. This was probably the secret of the immense influence these queens had in their day. To the soldiers, after hearing nothing but Greek at the courts of the satraps, it must have seemed like a whiff of their mountain air to hear a queen speak in their native tongue; for even Alexander in his *moments intimes* would address them μακεδονιστί, and this seems to me specially suitable in a trial before the national court of free soldiers, some of whom might not understand an argument in Greek. The life of Cleopatra shows us also, what we see in many other instances, that she regarded marriage merely as a state affair, with a view to power and alliance. She would willingly barter her royal name and perhaps large possessions for the armies and the ambition of a Macedonian satrap-general. Most of Alexander's staff were sprung from noble houses, and though subjects now, had once been independent princes.[1] She would, doubtless, have regarded a marriage with Eumenes a grave *mésalliance*, only to be excused by urgent state reasons; but to invite Leonnatus or Ptolemy to be her husband was as natural to her as for these princes to enter into any alliance for the furtherance of their power.

But as Olympias or Cleopatra might have been oriental princesses, so Roxane could murder her rivals and their children just like the Macedonian Olympias. When we come

[1] This marks the great difference between Napoleon's generals and the generals of Alexander. Both Napoleon and his generals were upstarts, whereas Alexander was a hereditary king, and almost all his generals hereditary princes, like many generals in the present German army. This, too, helps to explain how the Frenchmen failed as independent sovrans, while the Macedonians succeeded.

to Kynane, the daughter of Philip by an Illyrian mother, and her daughter Eurydike, married by the wish of the Macedonians to Philip Arridaeus, we find quite a different type. This princess went to war on horseback, and charged the enemy like her cousin, the King of Macedonia. He had put to death her husband Amyntas, and she was a widow; but she preferred war to married life, and is even said to have killed another Illyrian princess or queen in the shock of battle. One wonders that the historians of Alexander went to the wild regions about the Caspian for their Amazons to glorify the conqueror. On Alexander's death she determined to take part in the division of the world; she set out with an armed escort and her daughter Eurydike, whom she desired to marry to Philip Arridaeus; she burst through the troops Antipater sent to stop her, charging them gallantly with the spear; she forced her way to Asia, and when met by Alketas, the regent Perdikkas's brother, who was determined to kill her, she so influenced his Macedonians by her boldness and eloquence that she had to be murdered secretly, and even then the marriage she had proposed was insisted on by the angry soldiery. The new queen Eurydike from henceforth plays a prominent part in the bloody politics of the house of Alexander, and would have been queen in Macedonia but for the superior claims of Olympias to Macedonian respect. As the troops of Alketas would not fight against her and Kynane, so her troops deserted her when she led them against the queen-mother. It was the moment when Olympias's pent-up fury burst out after many years. Amid her orgies of murder and of disentombing her enemies, she was not likely to spare the offspring of Philip's faithlessness, for Philip Arridaeus was the son of a Thessalian dancing girl, and Eurydike of an Illyrian savage. She shut them up and meant to kill them

by gradual starvation. But her people began to expostulate, and then having Philip shot by Thracians, she sent Eurydike the sword, the halter, and the hemlock, to take her choice. 'But she, praying that Olympias might receive the same gifts, composed the limbs of her husband, and washed his wounds as best she could, and then without one word of complaint at her fate or the greatness of her misfortune, hanged herself with her girdle.' If these women knew not how to live, they knew how to die.[1]

And as all the Diadochi sought family alliances one with the other, and not unfrequently exchanged one alliance for another, there was a whole society of such princesses, all interconnected in the most complicated way, all knowing and most of them hating one another, and yet all together forming a brilliant and lively society, whose ways and manners must have had a powerful influence on the life of all classes of their subjects. How little sanctity the bond of marriage had in their eyes is shown not only by the anecdotes already related, but especially by the indignant astonishment of Seleucus that his son Antiochus should be allowed to pine away for love of a married woman. The wily physician indeed pretended it was his own wife, but when he had safely ascertained the king's mind, he told him that Antiochus was dying for love of his step-mother, the new queen, sister to King Demetrius. Then the king does not hesitate to resign her to his son. It seems also that the old titular-regent, Polyperchon, married his son's widow, Kratesipolis, an excellent woman, and beloved on account of her kindness to the poor.[2] When her husband died, who was at the

[1] Diod. xix. 11. Plutarch (*de educ. puerorum* 20) says that though an out-and-out barbarian (τριβάρβαρος οὖσα), she had herself educated late in life, in order that she might teach her children.

[2] Diod. xix. 67. In the later case of Eumenes and Attalus II. of Pergamum, the former being announced to be dead, his brother seized

time lord of Sicyon, and the citizens revolted from her, despising her as a woman, she met them, herself commanding, in fair battle, defeated them, and crucified thirty. Thus established as tyrant of Sicyon, this noble and excellent person signified to the handsome Demetrius that she was open to his advances, but the assignation was rudely interrupted, and Demetrius had to fly for his life.[1]

Perhaps the woman who bears the highest character of all the gallery of queens in that day was Phila, the daughter of Antipater, married to Craterus, and after his death to Demetrius. To this handsome wayward husband she was so attached that all his inconstancies, his new marriages, his disgraces, could not alter her affection. She bore him a noble and devoted son, Antigonus, and was thus the mother of the famous line of Macedonian kings. She helped her husband always, even in his long absences, with her influence. We may conceive her attaining the summit of her wishes when Demetrius, after many buffetings of fortune, became King of Macedonia. For seven years she lived as queen in her own country, and no doubt strove hard to curb the wild ambition of this new Alcibiades. But when he began to make vast preparations to reconquer the world; when his people rebelled, and a coalition of Pyrrhus, Lysimachus, and Ptolemy ousted him, and drove him once more into exile, the noble-hearted Phila could endure her fate no longer, and took poison to escape from the troubles of her life.

We have no picture of her character, but all her known acts, and the son she brought up, speak for her as a noble

the crown and his brother's queen Stratonike. But finding himself mistaken, he loyally gave back crown and lady to Eumenes when he returned. The latter received them without comment, and held both for some years to come. Plut. *de frat. amore* § 19.

[1] Plutarch tells this story.

exception to her class. Nevertheless even she devoted herself to a husband more shameless than the rest in his infidelities. The Egyptian princesses will come before us again in connexion with their kingdom, one of whom, the Egyptian Arsinoe, married Keraunus, the murderer of the excellent Agathocles, of Seleucus, and of her own children. But enough, nay more than enough, has been said on this wild and painful feature of the times.

But it is well to remember that the art of the period still shows very noble and ideal work. The famous *Nike* brought from Samothrace, which represents a monument of Victory set up by Demetrius Poliorketes, is among the most splendid remains of Greek sculpture, and shows that in the school of Lysippus, from which the sculptor derived his style, there were nameless men who could do better work than the greatest of modern masters. Here, as in the case of the tomb of Sidon, work of the greatest genius appears without being noticed by the art-critics. It is from a coin of Samothrace which reproduces the figure that its restoration has been effected.[1]

Let us now turn to consider plainer people and more natural life, and see how far it was influenced by these brilliant, but turbulent and immoral courts.

[1] Cf. Overbeck *G. P.* ii. p. 314.

CHAPTER V

HOME POLITICS DURING THE WARS OF THE DIADOCHI

LET me begin this chapter with a striking passage from Cicero: *Itaque, ut hanc Graeciam, quae iamdiu suis consiliis perculsa et afflicta est, omittam: illa vetus, quae quondam opibus, imperio, gloria floruit, hoc uno malo concidit, libertate immoderata ac licentia concionum. quum in theatro imperiti homines, rerum omnium rudes ignarique, consederant: tum bella inutilia suscipiebant, tum seditiosos homines reipublicae praeficiebant, tum optime meritos cives e civitate eiciebant.*[1] It is all the more necessary for me to preach upon this text, as Prof. A. Holm, in his brilliant fourth volume, has given us quite a different estimate of the society of this epoch. He thinks that the 'free' Greek communities were still the salt of the earth, and the kings a set of immoral and over-rated despots. He considers a republic without a second chamber a safer and better constitution. It is well, therefore, to state the evidence on the other side. It is a great misfortune entailed upon us by war, that it not only tends to destroy all the quiet phases of culture—home life, domestic virtues, country pursuits, but it so absorbs the interest of spectators and historians that whatever social life it does not actually destroy becomes obscure and falls into

[1] *pro Flacco* § 16.

oblivion. Thus Thucydides fills his great work with the details of petty campaigns, and will not tell us a word of the life of men, of the matchless art of his time, very little even of the inner political condition of the Greece of his day. The bravery of Brasidas seems to him far more worthy of narration than the cunning of Phidias; the sea battles of Phormio than the adventurous trading among the tribes of Gaul or the Crimea; and most unfortunately his example is followed by most of his fellow historians. Diodorus's history, our only remaining consecutive account of this period,[1] is almost altogether devoted to campaigns and battles, and thus when Plutarch came to write his inestimable *Lives* other material was much lacking.

There were, indeed, in the generations immediately succeeding that of Alexander, historians who felt the dryness of such narrative, and sought to relieve it by anecdotes. These men—Phylarchus, Duris, Proxenus, and others—are quoted in our extant documents. But the general practice of modern historians has been to discredit these tendencies in the later Greek writers, and set down this practice of telling stories as the mere anecdotage of Hellenic historiography. For our purpose, however, provided the historians belonged to the age which they described, anecdotes, even if not strictly true, will express what was thought suitable and natural at the time, and may therefore fairly be used for social inferences. So also the hostility displayed against some kings, and partiality to others, though it may distort strict history, and even falsify the picture we form of some of its characters, will at least give us a

[1] Yet Diodorus, who builds his work on Hieronymus of Cardia, is inestimable to us as a consecutive and rational historian of a most difficult period. When we lose him as a guide, just before the battle of Ipsus, we find ourselves floundering in the dark till Polybius comes to our aid.

notion of what was said and thought about them by ordinary society in their day. But unfortunately such traits are only reported, with the rarest exceptions, of kings and of philosophers. There was indeed a book of the 'wise and witty sayings of courtesans,' but of simpler and better people we hear very little indeed. The only insight we have into their life is to be got from the New Comedy, either in the collected Greek fragments, or the loose translations of Plautus. Here too we are led to suspect conventionalism, and that the *mise en scène* is mere scaffolding to support exhibitions ot style and of facile social philosophy. But what use is there in quarrelling with our materials? They are indeed very poor and bad, yet our business is not to make the worst, but the best of them.

Let us begin with Athens, which as usual leads in importance, and is still thoroughly recognised as the real centre and eye of Greece. We have, in the period before us, three perfectly distinct pictures of life at Athens: one of the political riots or excitements which occasionally disgraced the city; a second of the schools of the philosophers, which were rapidly becoming the most respectable feature in Attic society; a third of the social habits on the stage, as seen in the genteel comedy of the day. These three societies are so strongly contrasted that it is very difficult to accept them all, or to understand their co-existence in a small capital like Athens. But let us first produce our facts.

The reader must remember that at Athens, and probably thoughout Greece, the conflict was no longer between aristocrats and democrats, but between rich and poor. At Athens certainly, the Revolution of 411 and the Restoration of 403 B.C. had settled that question. From thence onward it is a question how much the rich shall contribute, not whether the noble families shall maintain their influence.

I believe the most analogous condition of things to be found in our day is in Geneva, where the completed democracy looks upon its richer members as intended to bear all the burdens of the state.

At Athens this was particularly the case in war times, when the mob voted the estimates and the rich had to supply them. Thus the only chance of avoiding ruinous war expenses was to keep the populace in good humour by those amusements which must be curtailed by war. For the question of expense is really the main obstacle which prevents a nation carrying its sentimental outbursts of indignation into effect. We must therefore expect to find all through this period the rich on the side of peace, those in fact who had something to lose advocating the policy of keeping quiet; while the populace, who loved hearing speeches and passing resolutions, were ready for any excitement, and would rush into wars which could do the indigent no harm, but might, with the banishment of the peace party, bring unexpected gains into their hands.

Thus Diodorus tells us :—

As for the Athenian people, the men of substance counselled them to keep quiet, while the demagogues stirred up the masses and urged them to take up the war vigorously. The war party—men used to making their living as mercenaries, easily prevailed by their numbers. These were the men of whom Philip once said that to them war was peace, and peace war. The public speakers, putting into shape the impulses of the populace, forthwith drew up a resolution that the people should take thought for the common liberties of Greece, set free the cities now being besieged, and get ready forty triremes and two hundred quadriremes. All Athenians under forty years of age were to take the field, three tribes being told off to guard Attica, while the remaining seven held themselves in readiness for foreign service. Furthermore it was proposed to send out ambassadors to the cities of Greece and proclaim that, as

formerly the Athenian people, holding all Hellas to be the common fatherland of the Hellenes, had repelled by sea the barbarians who came to impose the yoke of slavery, so now they considered themselves bound to risk their lives, their money, and their ships for the common safety of the Greeks. This resolution was carried only too easily. The shrewder Greeks said that the Athenian people had certainly been well advised so far as glory was concerned, but had failed in point of policy, inasmuch as they had acted too soon, had run the serious risk of attacking unbeaten and powerful forces, and for all their boasted wisdom had not taken warning by the fate of the Thebans. Nevertheless the ambassadors went the round of the cities and recommended war with their accustomed plausibility, so that the greater number, whether as leagues or as individual cities, embraced the alliance.[1]

The only remedy the rich could find was in the support of a foreign power, such as Macedonia, which sent a garrison with a military governor, who either controlled the populace by force, or by altering the constitution introduced a property franchise, so that the poor lost all political power, and were moreover restrained by troops from revolution.

Under these circumstances a vast number went into voluntary exile, others were driven out. If they went to Asia, and entered as mercenaries into the service of the Macedonian satraps, they generally made money, and lived in luxury; but this did not always console them for their exile, even when voluntary; and like the Irish now prospering in America, who nourish feelings of bitter hate against the English rule, to which they ascribe their emigration, these exiles were often looking forward to the day of their return to their country in power, to declare its autonomy.

[1] Diod. Sic. xviii. 10. This was upon the news of the death of Alexander, perhaps an excusable or commendable action; but, in a hundred other cases, similar counsels prevailed when there was little excuse for them.

There is, at any rate, this remarkable point of likeness, that while many must have profited immensely by being sent out of the old country, no amount of material gains destroyed their strong sentiment as regards the liberty of their home city, and their hatred to the kings or tyrants who had been the occasion of their improved fortune.

On the other hand, while the sentimental objections to a foreign garrison were insuperable, and while no doubt foreign soldiery and their leaders were often a serious obstacle to the moral and family life of the remaining citizens, we know that in many cases the better classes, including the philosophers, lived on good terms with moderate and humane military governors, and that though political excitement was suppressed, social and material wellbeing were amply secured.

We should expect to hear of the return of exiles of both classes, the rich or philo-Macedonian and the poor or Home Rule party. And we should have expected to find scenes of blood similar to those which disgraced the history of Greece in Thucydides's day,[1] and which he falsely says were till then unknown. Yet all the restorations which come before us at this epoch seem to be those of exiled democrats. The famous rescript of Alexander, sent from Babylon to Olympia, which caused such a stir in Greece, must have been intended chiefly to favour those who had been exiled by the Macedonian party in each city, on the plea of keeping the cities quiet and subservient to the regent, Antipater. Alexander seems therefore to have been guilty of a quibble when he declared to the 20,000 exiles assembled at Olympia: 'King Alexander to the exiles from Hellenic cities.[2] We have not been the cause of your exile, but shall be the cause of your return to your respective countries, excepting

[1] iii. 83 *sq.* [2] Diod. xviii. 8.

those exiled under a curse. We have also written to Antipater to compel the cities which may be unwilling to restore you.' This order, while it was a direct violation of the treaty of Corinth, whereby the cities were to be individually and internally autonomous, contained a bid for democratic support quite foreign to all previous Macedonian policy in Greece.[1] Possibly it arose from supreme contempt of all the parties in Greece, nor do we know how the king intended to follow up his policy, if policy it was. But like most acts of Alexander, it led to a series of imitations on the part of the successors to his power, as well as to the determined opposition of Casander, who here as elsewhere set himself to annul the acts of Alexander.

No sooner had Antipater subdued the bold attempt of the assembled Greeks to shake off the Macedonian yoke —it cost him a close beleaguerment in Lamia, then two battles and a very hard fought victory—than he first dismembered the Greek alliance, ill cemented as usual, by treating with each separately, and then restored his influence everywhere by the same means that he adopted at Athens. He demanded the surrender of the leading firebrands of liberty, such as Demosthenes and Hypereides; he abolished manhood suffrage, and introduced a property qualification; he put a garrison in Munychia. We cannot tell how far he succeeded in deporting the disfranchised poor, but the numbers and figures given by Diodorus[2] are very important in affording a view of the then wealth and population of Athens. When they surrendered unconditionally 'he treated them,' says the historian, 'with consideration, and allowed

[1] In Asia Minor, as I already observed, the Hellenic cities were freed from despots and oligarchies, which had ruled them in favour of Persia, and democracies were everywhere restored.

[2] xviii. 18.

them to keep their city and possessions; he changed their polity from a democracy into a property franchise, and gave those possessed of more than 2000 drachmae (about £75 of our money) the control of the state and votes, but all those below this figure, as being turbulent and quarrelsome, he expelled from political rights, and to those of them that chose he gave settlements in Thrace.[1] These, being more than 12,000, were removed from their country; the remainder who were qualified, being about 9000, were declared owners of the city and territory, and lived according to the laws of Solon.' He put Menyllus as military governor into the fort of Munychia to keep them from revolution. 'So the Athenians being unexpectedly well treated obtained peace, and afterwards, being free from political disturbance, and in safe enjoyment of their country, they quickly ran up in the scale in wealth.'

This general settlement, of which Athens gives us the type, was received throughout Greece with laudations, and the voting of crowns to Antipater. It was confirmed by Casander, who, when they afterwards sent him Demades to request the withdrawal of the garrison, put that person to death on the well-founded charge of secret machinations in Asia, and so made practically a final settlement. It reduced largely the number of citizens, and restored wealth and peace to the city, but imposed insignificance upon it for ever.

Let us briefly trace its history during the period before us. The settlement of Antipater was in 322 B.C. He and Casander at first managed Athens by means of the worthy

[1] Exile from Greece seems to have been defined by removing beyond the Acroceraunian Mountains and Cape Taenarus (Plut. *Phoc.* 29). The eastern limits are not stated. Phocion persuaded Antipater to allow some to settle in the Peloponnesus.

Phocion and the villainous Demades. Peace and prosperity were restored till 319 B.C., when the new regent, Polyperchon, wishing to checkmate Casander's influence, issued the first of these ridiculous proclamations, declaring all the Greeks free and independent. From Polyperchon to Flamininus, nay to Nero, these proclamations were made at intervals, and on every occasion were received with acclamations by the great public of Greece. I should rather have said by the mob, for from Phocion to Polybius the wiser and calmer people knew that all this was illusion, that petty cities and cantons cannot exercise imperial rights beside great empires, and that without political importance political rights are a mere farce.

The rescript of Polyperchon, composed in the name of his silly ward, King Philip Arridaeus, is a curious document, but too long to quote here.[1] It proposes to restore to the Greeks, not absolute liberty, but the constitutions sanctioned by Philip II. and his son Alexander (a clear proof that the dependence on Macedonia was accepted on all sides), and to abolish the wise arrangements of Antipater. It was no peace measure, but a war measure directed against Casander. The old general even advised at Argos certain executions and banishments in order to strengthen his party.[2] Then were re-enacted the former scenes of violence, and the growing peace of Hellas was rudely checked. The exiles, as usual, came back full of bloodthirsty fury, and wreaked their vengeance on those of their fellow-citizens who had monopolised civic privileges—all the more gladly as the latter were everywhere the holders of property. By a fortunate accident, the circumstances of the moment at Athens are preserved to us in Plutarch's *Life of Phocion*.[3]

[1] Diod. xviii. 56. [2] Diod. xviii. 69.

[3] Cf. also Diod. xviii. 65 *sq.*

The fort of Munychia was still held by an officer of Casander, Nicanor, whom he had sent to replace Menyllus at the moment of the crisis of Antipater's death. This commander, like Menyllus, was a worthy man, and well disposed to keep the city in peace and order. But his presence was not only a galling obstacle to the democrats; it was a thorn in the side of Polyperchon, whose object in 'freeing Athens' was merely to substitute a garrison of his own in this all-important military position. The facts remind us of the frequent remark of Polybius, that man, apparently the wisest, is really the silliest of all animals, for though he is always being deceived by the same snares and devices, they still have their effect, and delude men as perfectly as if they had never been used before. Within a year the Athenians were so disgusted at their deliverer and the mob of exiles he had let loose upon them, that overtures were made to Casander, and he recovered his hold upon Athens under a compact, by which the franchise of Antipater (2000 drachmae) was lowered to 1000, and the Athenians were to nominate a governor whom he should approve. It was thus that the philosopher, Demetrius of Phaleron, was appointed regent at Athens, which he controlled for ten years of fresh peace and national prosperity.

This rodomontade of 'freeing the Greeks' was again employed by Antigonus (312 B.C.), and by Ptolemy (311 B.C.), to show that he was as good a master as his rival, and indeed with special application to the cities of Asia Minor. Then in 308 B.C. Demetrius comes himself with all his royal splendour to free Athens and the Greeks, and allow them to exhibit to the world the use they made of this freedom.

Let us hear Plutarch's account of their first essay in recovered liberty (in 319 B.C.), when the army of Alexander,

Polyperchon's son, allowed the populace full freedom of discussion.

Meantime Polyperchon, to whom the care of the king's person was committed, in order to countermine Casander, wrote letters to the Athenians, stating, 'That the king restored them their ancient form of government'; according to which, all the people had a right to public employments. This was a snare he laid for Phocion. For, being desirous of making himself master of Athens (as soon appeared from his actions), he was sensible that he could not effect anything while Phocion was in the way. He saw, too, that his expulsion would be no difficult task, when all who had been excluded from a share in the administration were restored; and the orators and public informers were once more masters of the tribunals.

As these letters raised great commotion among the people, Nicanor was desired to speak to them on that subject in the Peiraeus: and for that purpose entered their assembly, trusting his person with Phocion. Dercyllus, who commanded for the king in the adjacent country, laid a scheme to seize him: but Nicanor getting timely information of his design, guarded against it, and soon showed that he would wreak his vengeance on the city. Phocion then was blamed for letting him go when he had him in his hands; but he answered, 'He could confide in Nicanor's promises, and saw no reason to suspect him of any ill design.' 'However,' said he, 'be the issue what it may, I had rather be found suffering than doing what is unjust.'

For the truth is, he had such confidence in Nicanor, that when he had accounts brought him from several hands of his design upon the Peiraeus, of his ordering a body of mercenaries to Salamis, and of his bribing some of the inhabitants of the Peiraeus, he would give no credit to any of those things. Nay, when Philomedes got an edict passed, that all the Athenians should take up arms, and obey the orders of Phocion, the latter took no care to act in pursuance of it, till Nicanor had brought his troops out of Munychia, and carried his trenches round the Peiraeus. Then Phocion would have led the Athenians against him; but by this time they were become mutinous, and looked upon their commander with contempt.

At this juncture arrived Alexander, the son of Polyperchon, with an army, under pretence of assisting the city against Nicanor; but, in reality, to avail himself of its fatal divisions, and to seize it, if possible, for himself. For the exiles who entered the town with him, the foreigners, and such citizens as had been degraded as infamous, with other mean people, resorted to him, and altogether made up a strange disorderly assembly, by whose suffrages the command was taken from Phocion, and other generals appointed. Had not Alexander been seen alone near the walls in conference with Nicanor, and by repeated interviews given the Athenians cause of suspicion, the city could not have escaped the danger it was in. Immediately the orator Agnonides singled out Phocion, and accused him of treason. Phocion, with such of his friends as did not forsake him, repaired to Polyperchon. Solon of Plataea, and Dinarchus of Corinth, who passed for the friends and confidants of Polyperchon, out of regard to Phocion, desired to be of the party. But Dinarchus falling ill by the way, they were obliged to stop many days at Elatea. In the meantime, Archestratus proposed a decree, and Agnonides got it passed, that deputies should be sent to Polyperchon with an accusation against Phocion.

The two parties came up to Polyperchon at the same time, as he was upon his march with the king, near Pharuges, a town of Phocis. There Polyperchon placed the king under a golden canopy, and his friends on each side of him; and, before he proceeded to any other business, gave orders that Dinarchus should be put to the torture, and afterwards despatched. This done, he gave the Athenians audience. But, as they filled the place with noise and tumult, interrupting each other with mutual accusations to the council, Agnonides pressed forward and said, 'Put us all in one cage, and send us back to Athens, to give account of our conduct there.' The king laughed at the proposal: but the Macedonians who attended on that occasion, and the strangers who were drawn thither by curiosity, were desirous of hearing the cause; and therefore made signs to the deputies to argue the matter there. However it was far from being conducted with impartiality. Polyperchon often interrupted Phocion, who at last was so provoked that he struck his staff upon the ground, and would speak no more. Hegemon said, Polyperchon himself could

bear witness to his affectionate regard for the people; and that general answered, 'Do you come here to slander me before the king?' Upon this the king started up, and was going to run Hegemon through with his spear; but Polyperchon prevented him: and the council broke up immediately.

The guards then surrounded Phocion and his party, except a few, who, being at some distance, muffled themselves up, and fled. Clitus carried the prisoners to Athens, under colour of having them tried there, but, in reality, only to have them put to death, as persons already condemned. The manner of conducting the thing made it a more melancholy scene. The prisoners were carried in carts through the Cerameicus to the theatre, where Clitus shut them up till the *Archons* had assembled the people. From this assembly neither slaves, nor foreigners, nor persons disfranchised as infamous, were excluded; the tribunal and the theatre were open to all. Then the king's letter was read; the purport of which was 'That he had found the prisoners guilty of treason; but that he left it to the Athenians, as freemen, who were to be governed by their own laws, to pass sentence upon them.'

At the same time Clitus presented them to the people. The best of the citizens, when they saw Phocion, appeared greatly dejected, and, covering their faces with their mantles, began to weep. One, however, had the courage to say, 'Since the king leaves the determination of so important a matter to the people, it would be proper to command all slaves and strangers to depart.' But the populace, instead of agreeing to that motion, cried out, 'It would be much more proper to stone all the favourers of oligarchy, all the enemies of the people.' After which, no one attempted to offer anything in behalf of Phocion. It was with much difficulty that he obtained permission to speak. At last, silence being made, he said, 'Do you design to take away my life justly or unjustly?' Some of them answering, 'Justly'; he said, 'How can you know whether it will be justly, if you do not hear me first?' As he did not find them inclined in the least to hear him, he advanced some paces forward, and said, 'Citizens of Athens, I acknowledge I have done you injustice; and for my faults in the administration, adjudge myself guilty of death; but why will you put these men to death, who have never injured you?' The populace made answer, 'Because they are your friends.'

Upon which he drew back, and resigned himself quietly to his fate.

Agnonides then read the decree he had prepared; according to which, the people were to declare by their suffrages whether the prisoners appeared to be guilty or not; and if they appeared so, they were to suffer death. When the decree was read, some called for an additional clause for putting Phocion to the torture before execution; and insisted, that the rack and its managers should be sent for immediately. But Agnonides, observing that Clitus was displeased at that proposal, and looking upon it himself as a barbarous and detestable thing, said, 'When we take that villain Callimedon, let us put him to the torture; but, indeed, my fellow-citizens, I cannot consent that Phocion should have such hard measure.' Upon this, one of the better disposed Athenians cried out, 'Thou art certainly right; for if we torture Phocion, what must we do to thee?' There was, however, hardly one negative when the sentence of death was proposed: all the people gave their voices standing; and some of them even crowned themselves with flowers, as if it had been a matter of festivity.[1]

Such being the way in which the restored democracy treated their noblest and most respected enemies, let us see how they behaved to their friends. Here again we have a striking picture from Plutarch. In 308 B.C., as I have said, Antigonus, desiring to give greater effect to his bid for Hellenic support, and perhaps giving way to the solicitations of his generous and enthusiastic son, who may have had some chimera of a constitutional sovranty over cultivated and artistic Greeks in his youthful imagination, sent him to take and free Athens in person. This brilliant and handsome, but somewhat ostentatious young prince, effected his conquest with great skill. Being a prince, and accustomed to behave with courtesy and chivalry to his foes, he would not tolerate the horrors we have just seen under the liberation of

[1] Plut. *Phoc.* xxxiii. to the end (Langhorne's trans.).

Polyperchon. But he caused perhaps greater scandals of his own.

Upon this proclamation [of liberty], the people threw down their arms, and receiving the proposal with loud acclamations, desired Demetrius to land, and called him their benefactor and deliverer. Demetrius the Phalerean, and his partizans, thought it necessary to receive a man who came with such a superior force, though he should perform none of his promises, and accordingly sent deputies to make their submission. Demetrius received them in an obliging manner, and sent back with them Aristodemus the Milesian, a friend of his father's. At the same time, he was not unmindful of Demetrius the Phalerean, who, in this revolution, was more afraid of the citizens than of the enemy ; but out of regard to his character and virtue, sent him with a strong convoy to Thebes, agreeably to his request. He likewise assured the Athenians, that however desirous he might be to see their city, he would deny himself that pleasure till he had set it entirely free, by expelling the garrison. He therefore surrounded the fortress of Munychia with a ditch and rampart, to cut off its communication with the rest of the city, and then sailed to Megara, where Casander had another garrison.

On his arrival, he was informed that Kratesipolis, the wife of Alexander the son of Polyperchon, a celebrated beauty, was at Patrae, and had a desire to see him. In consequence of which he left his forces in the territory of Megara, and with a few light horse took the road to Patrae. When he was near the place, he drew off from his men, and pitched his tent apart, that Kratesipolis might not be perceived when she came to pay her visit. But a party of the enemy getting intelligence of this, fell suddenly upon him. In his alarm, he had only time to throw over him a mean cloak ; and, in that disguise, saved himself by flight. So near an infamous captivity had his intemperate love of beauty brought him. As for his tent, the enemy took it, with all the riches it contained.

After Megara was taken, the soldiers prepared to plunder it ; but the Athenians interceded strongly for that people, and prevailed. Demetrius was satisfied with expelling the garrison, and declared the city free. Amidst these transactions, he bethought himself of Stilpo, a philosopher of great reputation,

who sought only the retirement and tranquillity of a studious life. He sent for him, and asked him 'Whether they had taken anything from him?' 'No,' said Stilpo, 'I found none that wanted to steal any knowledge.' The soldiers, however, had clandestinely carried off almost all the slaves. Therefore, when Demetrius paid his respects to him again, on leaving the place, he said, 'Stilpo, I leave you entirely free.' 'True,' answered Stilpo, 'for you have not left a slave among us.'

Demetrius then returned to the siege of Munychia, dislodged the garrison, and demolished the fortress. After which the Athenians pressed him to enter the city, and he complied. Having assembled the people, he re-established the commonwealth in its ancient form; and, moreover, promised them, in the name of his father, a hundred and fifty thousand measures of wheat, and timber enough to build a hundred galleys. Thus they recovered the democracy fifteen years after it was dissolved. During the interval, after the Lamian war, and the battle of Cranon, the government was called an oligarchy, but was monarchical in fact; for the power of Demetrius the Phalerean met with no control.

Their deliverer appeared glorious in his services to Athens; but they rendered him obnoxious by the extravagant honours they decreed him. For they were the first who gave him and his father Antigonus the title of *kings*, which they had hitherto religiously avoided; and which was, indeed, the only thing left to the descendants of Philip and Alexander, uninvaded by their generals. In the next place, they alone honoured them with the appellation of the *gods protectors*; and, instead of denominating the year as formerly, from the archon, they abolished his office, created annually in his room a priest of those gods protectors, and prefixed his name to all their public acts.[1] They likewise ordered that their portraits should be wrought in the holy veil with those of the other gods. They consecrated the place where their patron first alighted from his chariot, and erected an altar there to DEMETRIUS THE DESCENDER. They added two to the number of their tribes, and called them *Demetrias* and *Antigonis*; in consequence of which the senate, which before consisted of five hundred members, was to consist of six hundred; for each tribe supplied fifty.

[1] This was the practice adopted by Ptolemy and his successors in Egypt. But in this case Athens can hardly have been his model.

Stratocles, of whose invention these ingenious compliments were, thought of a stroke still higher. He procured a decree, that those who should be sent upon public business from the commonwealth of Athens to Antigonus and Demetrius, should not be called ambassadors, but *Theori*, a title which had been appropriated to those who, on the solemn festivals, carried the customary sacrifices to Delphi and Olympia, in the name of the Hellenic states. This Stratocles was, in all respects, a person of the most daring effrontery and the most debauched life, insomuch that he seemed to imitate the ancient Cleon in his scurrilous and licentious behaviour to the people.

When the Athenians were defeated in the sea-fight near Amorgos, he arrived at Athens before any account of the misfortune had been received, and passing through the Cerameicus with a chaplet on his head, told the people that they were victorious. He then moved that sacrifices of thanksgiving should be offered, and meat distributed among the tribes for a public entertainment. Two days after, the poor remains of the fleet were brought home; and the people, in great anger, calling him to answer for the deceit, he made his appearance in the height of the tumult, with the most consummate assurance, and said, 'What harm have I done you, in making you merry for two days?' Such was the impudence of Stratocles.

But there were other extravagances *hotter than fire itself*, as Aristophanes expresses it. One flatterer outdid even Stratocles in servility, by procuring a decree that Demetrius, whenever he visited Athens, should be received with the same honours that were paid to Demeter and Bacchus; and that whoever exceeded the rest in the splendour and magnificence of the reception he gave that prince, should have money out of the treasury, to enable him to set up some pious memorial of his success. These instances of adulation concluded with their changing the name of the month *Munychion* to *Demetrion*, with calling the last day of every month *Demetrias*; and the *Dionysia*, or feasts of Bacchus, *Demetria*.[1]

The gods soon showed how much they were offended at these things. For the veil in which were wrought the figures of Demetrius and Antigonus, along with those of Zeus and

[1] These honours remind us strongly of the honours heaped upon the fifth Ptolemy by the Egyptian priests, as recorded on the Rosetta stone. Cf. my *Empire of the Ptolemies* pp. 324 *sq.*

Athene, as they carried it through the Cerameicus, was rent asunder by a sudden storm of wind. Hemlock grew up in great quantities round the altars of those princes, though it is a plant seldom found in that country. On the day when the *Dionysia* were to be celebrated, they were forced to put a stop to the procession by the excessive cold, which came entirely out of season; and there fell so strong a hoar frost, that it blasted not only the vines and fig-trees, but great part of the corn on the blade. Hence, Philippides, who was an enemy to Stratocles, thus attacked him in one of his comedies:—'Who was the wicked cause of our vines being blasted by the frost, and of the sacred veil's being rent asunder? He who transferred the honours of the gods to men: it is he, not comedy, that is the ruin of the people.'

What exceeded all the rage of flattery we have mentioned was the decree proposed by Dromocleides the Sphettian; according to which they were to consult the oracle of Demetrius, as to the manner in which they were to dedicate certain shields at Delphi. It was conceived in these terms: 'In a fortunate hour, be it decreed by the people, that a citizen of Athens be appointed to go to the god protector, and, after due sacrifices offered, demand of Demetrius, the god protector, what will be the most pious, the most honourable and expeditious method of consecrating the intended offerings. And it is hereby enacted, that the people of Athens will follow the method dictated by his oracle.' By this mockery of incense to his vanity, who was scarcely in his senses before, they rendered him perfectly insane.[1]

The Athenians, though they had lavished honours upon him in the most extravagant manner, yet contrived on this occasion to appear new in their flattery. They gave orders that he should lodge in the back part of the Parthenon; which accordingly he did, and Minerva was said to have received him as her guest; a guest not very fit to come under her roof, or suitable to her virgin purity.

And Demetrius, who ought to have reverenced Minerva, if on no other account yet as his eldest sister (for so he affected to call her), behaved in such a manner to persons of both sexes who were above the condition of slaves, and the citadel was so polluted with his debaucheries, that it appeared to be kept

[1] Plut. *Demetr.* ix.-xiii.

sacred in some degree, when he indulged himself only with such prostitutes as Chrysis, Lamia, Demo, and Anticyra.

Some things we choose to pass over out of regard to the character of the city of Athens; but the virtue and chastity of Democles ought not to be left under the veil of silence. Democles was very young; and his beauty was no secret to Demetrius. Indeed, his surname unhappily declared it, for he was called Democles *the Handsome*. Demetrius, through his emissaries, left nothing unattempted to gain him by great offers, or to intimidate him by threats; but neither could prevail. He left the wrestling ring and all public exercises, and made use only of a private bath. Demetrius watched his opportunity, and surprised him there alone. The boy seeing nobody near to assist him, and the impossibility of resisting with any effect, took off the cover of the caldron, and jumped into the boiling water. It is true, he came to an unworthy end, but his sentiments were worthy of his country and of his personal merit.

Very different were those of Cleaenetus the son of Cleomedon. That youth having procured his father the remission of a fine of fifty talents, brought letters from Demetrius to the people, signifying his pleasure in that respect. By which he not only dishonoured himself, but brought great trouble upon the city. The people took off the fine, but at the same time they made a decree, that no citizen should for the future bring any letter from Demetrius. Yet when they found that Demetrius was disobliged at it, and expressed his resentment in strong terms, they not only repealed the act, but punished the persons who proposed and supported it, some with death, and some with banishment. They likewise passed a new edict, importing: 'That the people of Athens had resolved, that whatsoever thing Demetrius might command, should be accounted holy in respect of the gods, and just in respect of men.' Some person of better principle on this occasion happening to say, that Stratocles was mad in proposing such decrees, Demochares answered: 'He would be mad, if he were not mad.' Stratocles found his advantage in his servility; and for this saying Demochares was prosecuted and banished the city. To such meannesses were the Athenians brought, when the garrison seemed to be removed out of their city, and they pretended to be a free people![1]

[1] Plut. *Demetr.* xxiii., xxiv.

There was indeed a party at Athens disgusted at these things, and if there was a competition of poets to celebrate the Saviour and Descender, and if there were shrines consecrated to his minions and his courtesans, there were philosophers who stood aloof, politicians who scowled, and poets who even dared to speak out—I suppose when the Descender was not actually present to come down upon them. The extant *ithyphallus*, however, is so important that I have printed the text in Appendix A.

For Demetrius only came to Athens either to retake it when it had revolted, or to idle in dalliance through the holidays of his life. Casander made ceaseless efforts to recover it; for a moment even a ruthless tyrant, Lachares, held it in his own interest; or else the old democratic party struggled to clear out the garrisons which even the liberator had found necessary amid the gratitude of his faithless flatterers, and to restore the republic pure and simple. But though they succeeded in doing this after the death of Casander and the ruin of Demetrius in Asia, their antique grandeur of policy had been sadly marred by appeals to Pyrrhus for help against Demetrius, then to Lysimachus, and it was only the death of all the great generals and the distractions or insignificance of surrounding monarchs which gave even a temporary success to the bravery of Olympiodorus, who expelled the Macedonian garrisons, and to Demochares, who preached the policy of his uncle Demosthenes.[1] The limited democracy which followed upon the timocracy of Demetrius Phalereus, and which ruled Athens down to the Celtic wars, and for some years after,

[1] Some very mutilated remains of inscriptions both in Boeotian and Attic dialect, which apparently refer to this time, seem to prove that Athens and Thebes were now good friends. Cf. *Mitth. des deutsch. Inst.* vii. 352.

did not make Athens greater, and certainly made it poorer. The burdens of the rich would doubtless have been as intolerable as ever but for the splendid gifts from various kings, who, partly for political, partly also for aesthetical reasons, were anxious to gain or to maintain the goodwill of the Athenians.

Thus through most of the earlier wars of the period before us (323-278) Athens was ruled oligarchically under Macedonia, for the remainder it was ruled democratically under the control of the bravest and most successful opponents of Macedon, and of its policy. At last it became nominally free, but so obscure and unimportant was its liberation that no historian except Pausanias has preserved the name of its deliverer, and we are reduced to fragmentary eulogistic inscriptions to discover the importance of the leading politician of the day.[1]

Of the other Greek cities we have very little information, but enough to tell us that the events at Athens were repeated with but little variation. Thebes was rebuilt by Casander, so creating for him a strong centre of influence in Boeotia. Here too came the conflict between Demetrius, the pretended liberator, and the Macedonian party. Here too, after one conquest of Thebes, Demetrius was obliged to reconquer it, and this time to put a garrison into the Cadmea, as he had put one into the Peiraeus and the Museum to secure Athens. Similar conflicts took place at Argos, at Sicyon, at Corinth; Megalopolis alone, now one of the most important towns in Greece, seems to have held firmly with the Theban and Macedonian party. There was in fact no room for any independence in Greece save in those mountainous or inaccessible cantons where military operations were

[1] Cf. the evidence in Droysen's *Hellenismus* ii. 2, pp. 299 *sq.* He refers to the inscriptions.

tedious and expensive, and rapid conquests impossible. This was eminently the case with Sparta, attacked both by Demetrius and Pyrrhus during this period, but unsuccessfully; with Aetolia, rapidly rising in contrast to the cities of the plain into political importance; and with the wild shepherds of Achaea and northern Arcadia, who still however lay in obscurity. The citizens of all these states, even Sparta and its kings, were earning large foreign rewards as mercenaries, and so gradually altering the balance of wealth as well as of power in Greece.

Somewhat different was the political condition of the Asiatic cities, and again of the islands of the Aegean. The Asiatic cities had long been accustomed to live under the suzerainty of kings and satraps, and had learned to reconcile a moderate amount of local and internal independence with submission to greater political units. The craze therefore of 'freeing Hellenic cities' had by no means the effect among these large and rich communities that it had in poorer but freer Greece. In Asia Minor commercial interests were predominant, and provided the distant royalty or its satrap did not make heavy requisitions of money and supplies, people seem not to have felt it a disgrace or an intolerable burden to be subjects. No other policy had been for a long time back possible.

But there were a certain number of island cities, first of all Rhodes, then Cos, and also cities on peninsulas so walled off by nature and art from land as to be practically island cities, such as Cnidus, Halicarnassus, Byzantium, Heracleia (on the Euxine). In the full flood-tide of Alexander's successful invasion these cities learned from the tremendous sieges of Halicarnassus, and afterwards of Tyre, what island cities could do, and how they could pursue a totally different policy from that of their inland neighbours. To attack

them was a matter of great difficulty and doubtful success; artillery, which in that generation had so improved as to be more than a match for ordinary land defences, was almost powerless against fortified harbours, and the rocky sites of these towns made mining approaches from the land side impracticable. Close investment by land and sea was almost impossible, and so the policy of the kings was clearly one of neutrality towards these cities. To them, on the other hand, neutrality was even more necessary, for it enabled them to prosecute their merchant and carrying trade with enormous profits during wars between their allies on the mainland. Thus these cities gradually acquired an importance quite extraordinary in the Greek world. Their league and their policy of keeping the seas open for commerce will be discussed hereafter, but we cannot here pass over the rise of Rhodes, which appears suddenly, almost as one of the Diadochi to Alexander's power.

Pausanias tells us[1] that in his day the Pergamene people asserted themselves to be descended from Arcadians, who had migrated thither with Telephus, the opponent of Achilles, so celebrated in tragedy. If this be so, Pausanias naïvely adds, all the other achievements of this people have been forgotten, from their resistance to Agamemnon's invasion, till the recent conquest of Asia Minor and the repulse of the Galatae—in other words, they had no history before the days of Hellenism except their bold assertion of relationship to the Mysian Telephus. This legendary claim arose indeed more from political astuteness than from antiquarian taste. When the day came that the Romans interfered in the East, and desired to pose as legitimate members of the Hellenistic world, it was at Pergamum that was elaborated, if not invented, the story of the Aenead

[1] 1, 4, §§ 5, 6.

origin of the Roman kings. It was thus of real political value to show that the Pergamene people were descended from the old Mysian ally of the Trojans, who had sacrificed life and incurred loss to sustain the greatness of Troy. The Alexandrians, who were aware of the motive, repudiated this piece of genealogy, and Aristophanes of Byzantium even rejected as spurious the prophecy of Poseidon in the Iliad that the descendants of Aeneas should reign in the Troad. Alexandria could claim no mythical history, and thought it absurd that her sister-upstart should do so.[1]

The case of Rhodes was very different. Tlepolemus, chief of the Rhodians, figures in the Iliad, where he is slain by Sarpedon the Lycian, as if the poet had foreseen the future struggles of Rhodes to maintain a kingdom on the mainland. But in the account of Diodorus [2] Tlepolemus comes quite late in the mythical history of the island, which had evidently been colonised by Carians, Phoenicians, and perhaps Egyptians, before the son of Heracles, just mentioned, had come with his Dorian settlers. This appears not only from the legends, but from many features in the local worships of the island, such as human sacrifices, and the offering of a team of horses to Helios, by throwing them into the sea—practices which were not Hellenic. The stories of the Telchines, and their magic power in working metal, point also to the immigration of advanced handicrafts from the older cultures of Egypt and of Phoenicia.

In historical times the inhabitants were acknowledged Dorians, and the hero of Messene, Aristomenes, took refuge there; the Rhodian family of Diagoras, celebrated in Pindar's Odes, was foremost in Greece for distinctions in the great national contests at Olympia and elsewhere. We can

[1] Cf. Wilamowitz *Antigonos von Karystos* p. 161.
[2] v. 55, 56.

therefore well imagine the contempt with which the Rhodians regarded such upstart pretensions to Hellenic pedigree as those of the Pergamenes, and I cannot but conjecture that much of the chastity and severity of Rhodian taste and manners arose from this feeling of Hellenic aristocracy. While the other Hellenistic capitals were distinctly new, and the asylum of a mixed and mongrel population, Rhodes, though its greatness dated only from the death of Alexander, might claim to be purely Hellenic. This fact affords us the key-note to all the modulations in Rhodian art, even though it was deeply affected by the Hellenistic instruments which it could not but adopt.

It is not our province to trace the earlier history of the island, or of the old confederacy of Dorians, in which its towns joined with Cos and Cnidus in worshipping on Cape Triopas. The only fact here requiring comment is the *late* foundation of the great city itself by the three older cities—Lindos, Cameiros, and Ialysos—which, though maintaining their separate existence as polities, made what the Greeks call a *συνοικισμός*, and settled the government of the island at the north end, in the new city called Rhodes. This took place in 408 B.C.—that is to say, near the close of the Peloponnesian war. Though our informant, Diodorus, only tells us the bare fact, it is not hard to see that some able politician foresaw the impending ruin of Athens, and the possibility of founding a new naval power on the lines pointed out by Pericles as the only safeguard for Athens—viz. to mind their business at home, and look after their navy. For this purpose an island was even better suited than a city like Athens, which had often to resist an attack from land forces. It was plain that Sparta, however successful in the war, would never be a naval power of this kind; and so we may give the founders of Rhodes credit for far-

seeing genius in founding this new capital of a naval empire. Crete, indeed, was reputed in legend to have once occupied this position.

But the policy of the founder of the new city was not destined to take its effect for a full century, as Rhodes was obliged to work through its struggle of aristocracy and democracy, which lasted with various fortunes till the days of Alexander. The aristocrats were supported by Sparta, and again by Mausollus and Artemisia, who seized the island; the democrats at times by Athens, but generally by their own greater vigour and determination. In the days which concern us, the government was in the hands of a numerous and wise aristocracy of wealth, which so fostered the interests of the lower classes that no internal disturbances are reported. Having at first resisted Alexander, and furnished Persia with her able admirals, Memnon and Mentor, Rhodes submitted in good time, and sent ships to the siege of Tyre. We know that Alexander had a garrison there, which the Rhodians expelled at the news of his death, but what Diodorus means by saying (xx. 81) that Alexander promoted and favoured it, and honoured it above all cities of his sovranty by depositing there his will, I am at a loss to understand, for the whole account of Alexander's death implies distinctly that he had made no will.[1] But it is more than likely that the Rhodians undertook to keep the police of the Aegean for him, and that he empowered them formally to do so. It may be some distortion of this that we read in Diodorus, for at Alexander's death Rhodes appears in a new position, recognised as a naval power of the first order, and also as the leading emporium of trade

[1] C. Müller *Praef. ad pseudo-Callisth.* p. xxiii. (in Didot's Script. Alex. M.) attributes the story to the patriotic zeal of the historian Zeno, whom Polybius criticises (cf. p. 566).

in the Levant. I do not think this sudden rise can be explained without some special action on the part of Alexander. His connexion with Barsine, the beautiful widow of Memnon, who had obtained a Greek education, was no doubt used by the discreet Rhodians to influence the great king through his mistress. These are the conjectures I hazard to account for the fact related to us.

But the siege of Rhodes by Demetrius the Besieger is good evidence of the wealth and vigour which that city had already attained. It had not fought for any ideals, but had quietly acknowledged the real owner of the world, Alexander; then had kept up friendly relations with Casander, Lysimachus, Antigonus, and Ptolemy, its most dangerous as well as most profitable neighbour. It was the rivalry between Antigonus and Ptolemy which brought upon Rhodes the great attack which it in vain endeavoured to avoid by neutrality and diplomacy. The Rhodians tried all that could be done by eulogistic decrees and votive statues. When Demetrius appeared with his army and engines, they even agreed to submit to him, and give him assistance against Egypt. But when he demanded a hundred hostages as guarantee of their submission — a strange mistake — the shrewd aristocracy made up their minds that the day for concession was over, and determined to show how dangerous was the policy of attacking them.[1]

This siege of Rhodes may occupy us for a few moments, seeing that all the interest of the eastern world gathered about it, and all the world either helped in the fight or tried to allay it. Rhodes was managed by a wise aristocracy. We may imagine it the Venice of those days, and its navy had attained the efficiency which once had distinguished the Athenian. It had undertaken the safety of

[1] Diod. xx. 81 *sq.*

the sea-ways, and kept down the pirates, who were already an organised force. No doubt it was in hunting pirates that the ships were trained to that speed and precision of evolutions which they displayed in the war against Demetrius. He, on the other hand, got the pirates to join him, and they formed a regular division of his fleet.

Diodorus has left us a long and brilliant description of this great siege—the splendid and terrible effect of the great fleet arriving in broad day and plainly visible from the heights of the city, which rose like a theatre round its port; the large promises made by the Rhodians for valour, in the shape of money prizes, freedom to slaves, and pensions to the children and parents of those slain in the defence; the enormous force of Demetrius, 40,000 men, with endless camp-followers, coming 'to make private profit from the misfortunes of the belligerents.' The Rhodians had only 6000 citizens to bear arms, and 1000 resident aliens, but they had abundance of slaves, great resources in war material, and supplies were sent them in abundance by Casander, Lysimachus, and, above all, by Ptolemy, who kept also sending in mercenaries in as great numbers as the besieged could support.

The first great struggle was for the mouth of the harbour. Had Demetrius closed it the struggle would have been over. But the Rhodians kept it open by desperate fighting, and not only destroyed his engines but sent out swift cruisers, which intercepted his supplies,[1] captured pirate vessels, and made descents upon the mainland. Then Demetrius made his attack by land with the aid of that monstrous machine known as the Town-Taker, or *Helepolis*, which consisted of

[1] They even captured a ship with some of Demetrius's wardrobe, which they sent to Ptolemy, as being purple garments of a splendour only fit for kings to wear.

stories of woodwork, fenced with parapets and screens of raw hide, moved on wheels by the efforts of 3400 men, and discharging stones and arrows from all its stories. Even this, though it made great breaches in the wall, failed in its effect. Though some of the besiegers actually effected a lodgment inside the town, at the top of the theatre, and 'the women and children set up a howl as though the city were taken,' after a murderous conflict they were all killed or captured. It had been agreed that captives were to be ransomed at ten minae for a free man and five for a slave —a very high figure. At the same time, when some one proposed to throw down the statues of Antigonus and Demetrius they had lately set up, they rejected the proposal with scorn, thus showing their superior political condition to the cities of Greece; for even at Athens it was noted that the numerous statues of Demetrius Phalereus were all broken up, and the metal applied to the commonest uses the day after he fell. All the while there were embassies arriving from neutral powers offering their mediation, for the whole commercial interests of the Aegean depended on Rhodes. First came the Cnidians, and there was a short truce, but Demetrius would yield no point; then more than fifty ambassadors from Athens and other Greek towns, and another truce and much discussion. Lastly came the commonwealth of the Aetolians, and they succeeded not for their better arguments, but rather because the siege was not progressing quickly, and Demetrius had counted over 2300 missiles shot from the walls in one brief night attack. This showed that the resources of the town were inexhaustible. So peace was made on condition of the Rhodians being Demetrius's allies, except against Ptolemy, and giving 100 hostages who were not office-bearers. They then paid all their debts of gratitude to their own citizens and friendly

kings, but wishing to honour Ptolemy above all, sent to the shrine of Jupiter Ammon to ask if they might worship him as a god, and when they got permission they built him a temple.

Here was the policy which Athens attempted, but which could not be carried out in a town full of half-hearted citizens and blatant demagogues. It was the only course open to small communities. But even in Rhodes it could only be maintained by great devotion on the part of the citizens, a perfectly steady and calm government, and, consequently, by the active support of great neutral powers. This policy then, that of the neutrality of island commercial states, had begun. The policy of confederations among small states had hardly as yet seen the light, and was hidden in the mountain valleys of Corax and Erymanthus.

The reader will now have learned enough of the politics of the Greeks at this epoch to follow the necessary allusions in the succeeding sketches of social life and habits of thought. The thinkers and quiet people of the age, far apart as they may be from public life, and directly as they even avoid politics, cannot but affect and be affected by international relations and the strife of parties in each state.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATION OF ART AND LITERATURE TO THE SOCIAL LIFE OF THE PERIOD

We have now reviewed the political aspects of Greece—monarchy, the new and attractive idea in Hellenic political economy, represented by great sovrans with splendid courts, and imitated by every petty prince even in title; aristocracies of commercial cities, like that of Rhodes, carrying out the cautious policy of commercial magnates; turbulent democracies insisting to the last on the autonomy of every city and the equal rights of all free citizens. Let us turn to the nearer and more intimate evidences of the social life hidden from us by the great troubles of the times. And when this is done let us ascend from the material conditions of life, including the luxuries provided by art, from the pictures of ordinary society given us on the stage and in the anecdotes preserved by historians, to the higher regions of thought, where the philosophers were thinking out afresh the deeper problems of life.

We may regard it as certain that the greatest bar to the spread of material comfort in classical Greece was the continued isolation of its small states. Even those who are convinced that political liberty outweighs all other advantages, must confess that it now carried with it this serious

consequence. Apart from their constant wars, the difficulties which these polities all raised to the residence of aliens in any city—and their nearest neighbours were aliens—made any real community of ordinary life impossible. Nobody travelled for pleasure, still less did anybody think of residing abroad unless compelled by a legal sentence, or induced by the hopes of great commercial profit. Thus we know that in the details of everyday life the Greek cities varied very much more than do the cities of any large European kingdom. Even in this case the differences are far greater than appear at first sight. Take, for example, England and Ireland, separated by a stormy channel, though parts of the same empire. The highest classes in each, owing to constant communication, beginning with school life and ending with residence in the capital, have attained to a real unity of customs. But in the middle classes, and still more in the lower, there are innumerable small differences in the habits of everyday life which surprise and interest any accurate observer. Nor is it by any means to be explained by the English being nearer the great centres of civilisation, and therefore more advanced than the Irish. On the contrary, from a social point of view, the English are far behind their neighbours in many respects, and would probably copy some details of Irish life if brought often into contact with them. But hitherto the middle classes, or rather all classes except the highest, have been really so isolated as to be different peoples speaking the same language. I suppose the same thing might be said as regards the Scotch and English, but of the Scotch at home I have not sufficient experience to speak with confidence.

Let us consider one more instance, and of neighbouring capitals, severed by difference of government and

language, but very near to one another in many other senses —London and Paris. Without positive experience to the contrary, one might have thought that railways and steamers would of themselves have produced so constant an intercourse between these great *foci* of culture, that every convenient and practical discovery for the uses of life in the one would at once have passed to the other. And yet railways and steamers were plying for a whole generation before the first great Exhibition of 1851 brought real masses of French people to London. They found it, socially speaking, a perfectly barbarous place. The foreigner there felt himself a miserable alien, totally out of place, with no provision for his comfort or amusement. There are extant still the comic outbursts of disgust of French people who thought to get a Sunday's outing in the London of that day, and wandered starving along miles of pavement lined by closed shutters, finding a desert worse than the Sahara where they had counted upon recreation and plenty. Since those days the advantages of each city have been gradually imitated by the other, and yet it is only the other day that any large attempt was made in London to amuse respectable people in the open air on summer evenings.

These instances will bring home to the reader what I mean by the isolation of the Greek cities up to Alexander's time—an isolation which made any stranger walking in a Greek town, if not disliked, at least remarked or ridiculed as provincial or odd, while his manners and customs were set down as *not the right thing*, even if practically better than those of his critics. The comic poets tell us that a dinner-party at Thebes was totally different from one at Athens, and as to material arrangements superior; yet no Athenian of the classical days would have imitated his

Boeotian neighbours. The large class of people who profess to study the Greeks, and only know them through the peculiarities of the grammar of the language, will appreciate my point when I remind them that it required centuries to establish in Greece a common literary dialect. Whether it would ever have been done by the spiritual predominance of Athens is very doubtful; not doubtful is the fact that it was brought about by the political union of Greece under Alexander, and the spread of the use of Greek by his conquests to nations who could not undertake to appreciate niceties of dialect. Moreover the 'common dialect' of Hellenism was not Attic, but a practical organ of communication which sprang up without a history, and is found complete in the next generation, to serve all the world of literature and philosophy for many centuries to come. This was the outward and visible sign of the unity of Hellenism.

As regards, therefore, the habits of ordinary life, it may be taken as certain that the conquests of Alexander and the wars of the Successors produced an interchange of ideas in the Greek cities such as had never taken place before. The Asiatic towns had in this respect already received part of their training. Their common obedience to Persia had got rid of those political conceits still so deeply rooted in Greece, and we have little reason to believe that Smyrna and Ephesus differed in the private life of their citizens at all so much as Athens and Argos, not to say Sparta.[1] For they had long been mere units in the total of Asiatic cities under foreign supremacy. And though Alexander, and

[1] It is to be added that both Smyrna and Ephesus were to some extent new foundations, gathered from the neighbouring villages by Antigonus or Lysimachus. Many of the thriving towns in Asia Minor had undergone (we may believe) this renovation.

most of the Diadochi, left, or pretended to leave, each city in Greece its autonomy, it was not the same thing as of old. The alien, especially the Macedonian alien, was no longer to be despised or plundered as a mere outsider with no civic rights. Nay rather we may readily conceive rich and important aliens leading the fashion, even at Athens. How powerfully must the private life of fashionable young men at that time have been affected by the material comforts displayed in the household of King Demetrius the Besieger, or Casander, or any of the lords-lieutenant whom they sent to rule at their castle in Munychia! The luxuries of life even reached the philosophers, and were exhibited in the most extravagant form by Demetrius of Phaleron, for ten years the legate of Casander at Athens, as we shall see at greater length by and by. Intercourse between the cities must have increased enormously, and though I am not aware that Alexander forced upon the Hellenic confederacy any regulations as to port dues and import duties, the absence of any complaints on this score seems to show that some reasonable uniformity had been attained, and that either foreign men might reside in, or foreign goods be imported to, any city in Greece without annoying prohibitions.

The amount of Persian gold poured into Greece by the accidents of the conquest, not by its own industries, must have produced a revolution in prices not since equalled except by the influx of the gold of the Aztecs and Incas into Spain. There is not, I think, evidence of any depreciation of silver beyond what would certainly happen by the increase of gold-currency. It is seldom observed that this plenty of gold acted upon commerce, especially land commerce, like the use of paper money in recent times. The trader could carry on a single camel enough gold for very large transactions—a thing impossible with silver or copper.

I have already pointed out[1] how this change must have pressed upon poor people in Greece who did not share in the plunder. The price of even necessary and simple things must have often risen beyond their means. For the adventurers brought home large fortunes, and the traders and purveyors of the armies amassed them; and with these Eastern fortunes must have come in the taste for all the superior comforts and luxuries which they found among the Persian grandees. Not only the appointments of the table, in the way of plate and pottery, but the very tastes and flavours of Greek cookery must have profited by comparison with the knowledge of the East. So also the furniture, especially in carpets and hangings, must have copied Persian fashion, just as we still affect oriental stuffs and designs. It was not to be expected that the example of so many regal courts and so much royal ceremony should not affect those in contact with them. These influences were not only shown in the vulgar 'braggart captain,' who came to show off his sudden wealth in impudent extravagance among his old townspeople,[2] but in the ordinary life of rich young men. I imagine the personal appointments of Alcibiades, which were the talk of Greece in his day, would have appeared poor and mean beside those of Aratus, or of the generation which preceded him. Pictures and statues began to adorn private houses, and not temples or public buildings only—a change beginning to show itself in Demosthenes's day, but coming in like a torrent with the opening of Greece to the Eastern world. It was noticed that Phocion's house at Athens was modest in size

[1] pp. 4, 5.

[2] The *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus is copied from a Hellenistic model, and shows in an exaggerated sketch how good society estimated such men.

and furniture, but even this was relieved from shabbiness by the quaint wall decoration of shining plates of bronze[1] —a fashion dating from prehistoric times, but still admired for its very antiquity.

If it be true, as we shall see, that all kinds of art—painting, sculpture, music, architecture—began to aim at producing great effects, not at conveying great ideas, we may be sure private life was only a weaker echo of this dominant tone, and sought by outward taste or display to gain credit for refinement and knowledge of the world.

It is remarked by Overbeck[2] that in the period after Alexander no new or original development of art took place, and that no city of Greece started an independent school. He therefore calls even the great historical school of Rhodian and Pergamene sculpture the *after-bloom* of Greek art. But, however true this may be, it must not blind us to the fact, which no one has better illustrated than Overbeck himself, how in this period very splendid works of art were produced. We still have them in sculpture. The Nike of Samothrace, a splendid female figure with flying drapery, standing on a marble prow aloft, and blowing her trumpet, was a dedication of King Demetrius (for his naval victory over Ptolemy), which his biographers have not mentioned, but which was celebrated enough to become copied upon coins, and was really so great that any older master, even Phidias himself, would not have been ashamed to own her as his work. And yet the name of the artist is unknown.[3] The same thing may

[1] Plut. *Phoc.* 19. The interior surface of the great tomb, now known as the Treasury of Atreus, at Mycenae, was decorated in this manner.

[2] *Gesch. der griech. Plastik* iii. 188.

[3] Overbeck *op. cit.* ii. 314 *sq.* The learned have conjectured as the author Eutychides, a pupil of Lysippus and author of the sitting statue of Antioch, known from a copy in the Vatican.

be said of the famous Venus of Melos, now one of the treasures of the Louvre. It is indeed ascertained that the name of the sculptor was upon the pedestal; but it was removed by the finders because his name was obscure, and they desired to assert it as the work of the golden age. Nor is it possible to deny its artistic claim to this dignity without the closest and most technical study. It is now agreed that this famous work does not date earlier than 200-150 B.C., a period set down by those who study Greek only through grammar as late in the silver age. But the arts do not run abreast in parallel lines. The sculptor of the Venus probably spoke indifferent grammar; he probably forgot to write his adscript iota to his datives, but he knew how to carve, and how to follow in marble if not in grammar the procedure of the masters of the golden age.[1]

Since the former edition of this book, another great addition has been made to our evidence. The celebrated tomb of a king of Sidon, now the priceless ornament of the museum at Constantinople, is evidently the work of an Attic artist, and for a king of Sidon, possibly the Philocles who is mentioned by Diodorus as an ally and admiral of the first Ptolemy. The scenes on this sarcophagus are scenes of war and of hunting in which Persians, Macedonians, and Greeks take part. The Persians are treated with remarkable sympathy, and appear as noble and chivalrous as their adversaries. This work then, which must be from the time immediately succeeding Alexander, shows a wealth of design, of execution, of artistic feeling, fully worthy to be ranked next to those in the Parthenon frieze. Were the subjects not perfectly definite, and such as to mark the epoch, most critics would have attributed such a chef-d'œuvre to Praxiteles and his school.

And yet here too the name of the artist is unknown, and

[1] Overbeck *op. cit.* pp. 332 *sq.*

not a word transpires in any ancient work about so admirable a monument of artistic conception and of technique.[1] We may be certain that it was no decadent period of art when such forgetfulness was possible. We also know that the first great *national* struggle of the period—the repulse of the Gallic hordes which overran Greece in 278 B.C.—found its noblest expression in art, and that the victorious patriots chronicled their exultation in famous dedications to their gods, of which two at least, the Apollo (Belvedere) and Artemis of the Vatican, have impressed the modern world as much as any remaining monuments of plastic art. It was the same national feeling of Greek against barbarian that gave life and splendour to the Pergamene school, which exercised itself chiefly in the history of this conflict and its earlier prototypes, and from which the so-called 'Dying Gladiator' is now the best-known specimen.

But these great monuments only show that kings patronised art, which we already knew; and that cities did, great numbers of which are mentioned in connexion with famous works. There was as yet no centralisation in art, as there had been in politics. Patrae, Aliphera, Thespiae, Pleuron, Alyria (in Acarnania), Ambracia, and a hundred other second and third rate, and quite new, cities were celebrated for some masterpiece which people travelled to see. And so the immense diffusion of art, which is justly considered the main cause of its decay in deeper feeling and idea, must have produced a far greater influence on average Greek life than art had exercised in its earlier and more concentrated stages.

[1] The history of the discovery, with very fine reproductions of the designs, is to be found in Hamdi Bey's *Une Nécropole royale de Sidon* Paris 1892, of which the final volume has not yet appeared. Unfortunately this sumptuous work is very expensive.

The same effects must have been produced by the development of painting, which is acknowledged on all hands to have attained its highest bloom at this period. The Hellenistic world was ringing with the praises of Apelles and Protogenes, and men were repeating anecdotes about them as of the great personages of the day. Our familiar *ne sutor supra crepidam* was the remark of Apelles to a cobbler who had rectified his painting of a shoe, and was thereby emboldened to ascend with his strictures to the leg. The artist was even ruder to a Persian lord, who came to see him, and silenced him when he ventured to talk about art by saying: 'as long as you held your tongue you seemed to be somebody by reason of your gold and your purple, but now even these slaves grating the ochre laugh at you as being a fool.'[1] Protogenes had been for years painting his Ialysos in a suburb of Rhodes when Demetrius came to besiege the town. The Rhodians protested against the burning of the suburb which contained such a masterpiece. Demetrius replied he would as soon destroy his father's statues. This was the picture which the jealous Apelles came to see, and was so struck dumb that for a long time he could not recover from his admiration. The greatest of these pictures were now no longer frescoes on walls, but paintings on portable panels; they were exhibited singly for money, as in New Bond Street nowadays, and even with more ingenious circumstance, for Theon of Samos had

[1] Plut. *de tranq.* 12. Protogenes, who had long struggled with poverty, had at last risen to fame, and had adorned the Dionysion at Rhodes with his paintings, not frescoes, but on panels (πίναξι) and in frames, and so removable. Here was also exhibited his Resting Satyr, with the partridge beside him. The reader who wishes to appreciate the very modern jealousy and conceit of Hellenistic artists, even at Rhodes, will do well to study the passages collected by Overbeck, with anecdotes of this painter and of Apelles.

painted a famous single figure of an armed warrior rushing to battle, which was covered till a hired trumpeter had blown the alarum that the city was surprised, when the picture was unveiled to the excited spectators. Not only kings and cities, but wealthy private men could acquire and hang these pictures, and we may be sure that lesser artists copied or produced for lesser people what was in fashion among the great. They were strongly individualistic, whether it was the patron who got his own countenance, or his battles, or his hunting perpetuated by art, or the artist who, though he represented something without, thought all the while of the effect he would produce as an artist, and who knew that a work by an author of great name would interest men more than the same—I will not say a superior — work sent forth anonymously. Hence these artists were very jealous of their fame and envious of rivals, as most of the anecdotes about them show.[1] This strong individualism underlies every development of the age.

I notice as pointing in the same direction—that of the wider diffusion of art and therefore its larger effect on average life—the great extension in the range of subjects both of sculpture and painting. As in the early Middle Ages so in classical Greece, these arts had begun in the service of religion, or if not strictly so, at least in the service of the state, representing religious or semi-religious subjects of mythical celebrity. But now, as in the days of Raphael, portraiture of distinguished individuals became a separate and flourishing branch of art. Alexander refused to sit to any sculptor but Lysippus, to any painter but Apelles, though many others represented him on canvas

[1] These stories may be read most conveniently in Overbeck's *Schriftquellen.*

and in marble. So all the early Diadochi—Antigonus,[1] Demetrius, Ptolemy, Casander—had celebrated portraits of themselves made in bronze or in colours. So too the secularisation of art led artists to devise portrait statues or pictures of ancient men,[2] of whom no authentic likenesses were extant, the artist showing his talent by ideal heads of Homer, Hesiod, Solon, Sappho, Aeschylus, and other such worthies. It is interesting to note that at the same time the frequency of athlete statues diminished. Athletics were out of fashion, the greater people who could pay for statues did not compete, and the cities preferred the newer kinds of art at home to this once famous form of dedication on the site of victory. This drawing of imaginary portraits was accompanied by the fashion of drawing allegorical figures, in which the artist showed his talent in suggesting even spiritual qualities of a transient kind. The extent to which this allegorising was carried is quite a striking feature in the spirit of the times. Not only were the great mummeries at Alexandria or Antioch carried out like those of the later Middle Ages in Europe, with a host of allegorical figures representing the four seasons, plenty, war, famine, each city in the empire, and so forth, but there was even a famous statue of the *Nick of Time*,[3] and a famous picture

[1] It was noticed, apparently as a novelty, that Apelles painted the first Antigonus, known as *the one-eyed*, in profile, sitting on horseback, and not in full face, in order to conceal the defect, 'so that,' says Pliny, 'what was wanting to the face should rather seem wanting in the picture.' Cardinal Wolsey is said to have been painted in profile for a somewhat similar reason. I may notice that in Egyptian art profile portraits (reliefs) were the general rule.

[2] All the famous Athenians of this and the previous generation, Timotheus, Iphicrates, Chabrias, Conon, Lycurgus the Orator, Demosthenes, etc., were thus represented, but probably from genuine originals. —Overbeck *Schriftquellen* p. 269. Then came the philosophers.

[3] See the full descriptions of this statue of Καιρός (as a winged youth) cited in Overbeck *Schriftquellen* 1463, and following numbers. I

of *Calumny*, surrounded by her personified circumstances. This latter was suggested by a passage in the painter's life, when he incurred a great danger—the anger of the first (?) Ptolemy. Even more characteristic is the fact that the figures commonly spoken of as personifications of cities were in this age not so, but images of the *Fortune of the City*.[1] Thus Antioch, to take a very prominent example, had upon her coins a female figure with turreted crown and emblems of plenty, seated on a rock or mountain over the Orontes, represented, as was conventional, by a youth, part of whose figure was visible. This great capital, being new, and having no ancient shrine with its deity to be its tutelary genius, still more, perhaps, not requiring or deserving such a genius, set up the very secular conception of its τύχη, or *fortune*, in a personal form, and with the attributes of a deity. Afterwards such figures passed for personifications of the city itself, and so are handed down to modern art and have influenced modern language.

Our authorities fail us as to other arts, but we may be certain that the appointments of the table in themselves gave great room for elegance of design and richness of

shall revert to the subject in chapter xvii. Cf. the epigram of Posidippus in the *Anthol.* xvi. 275 (ed. Didot). There was a reproduction of the idea, a statuette in bronze, at the Royal Academy of 1890. It did not seem to me effective. There had already been a ὕμνος καιροῦ much earlier, composed by Ion of Chios. Plutarch tells us that Timoleon, that antique Garibaldi, set up in his house a shrine to Αὐτοματία or *Spontaneity*. As he owed all his successes to sudden impulses, which turned out to be inspirations, we can well imagine him regarding this suggesting force as Socrates did his restraining demon. But the worshipping of this unknown and probably invented type is characteristic. The processions of Alexandria will be described hereafter.

[1] This is said by late chroniclers to have been the portrait of a girl, who was formally buried alive under the foundations of the city, by way of good omen.

decoration in gold and silver.[1] And if the necessaries of life rose in price, we may be sure that all these articles of luxury fell, owing to the increased production or transportation of them.

The expense of having a portrait taken in bronze or in marble must have been considerably lowered by the device of Lysistratus,[2] who took a cast of the head in gypsum, and then copied it. This invention may be regarded as having an effect similar to that of photography in our own day. It reduces the artist to a tradesman, and lowers the whole conception of a portrait, which should reproduce not the momentary but the permanent lineaments, and so the general character of a face. But still it must, if it attained any wide adoption, have enabled a large number of people to indulge their vanity with this imitation of art.[3]

It remains to inquire whether the art of the period before us shows any spiritual side which we may fairly attribute not to the artists only, but to the atmosphere in which they lived. The most competent inquirers have noted in it two points as capital; first, the pride of complete mastery and finish in technique, which men like Lysippus and Apelles manifested all through their lives; secondly, the desire to be striking or to produce great effects, such as was shown in the colossus of Rhodes, and still more in the proposal of Deinocrates to carve Mount Athos into a sitting figure of Alexander, with a town of 10,000 inhabitants lying in one hand, while the other poured from an urn a mountain

[1] This whole subject has been illustrated, as regards the debt of Rome to Alexandria, by M. Schreiber in a masterly article published in the *Transactions of the Saxon Academy* (Leipzig) for 1894.

[2] Overbeck *Griech. Plastik* ii. 130.

[3] So the *flatterer* in Theophrastus tells his patron—evidently as a stock compliment—'that his (portrait) statue is the image of him.'

torrent into the sea.[1] These features have already come before us in considering Demetrius the Besieger, the most characteristic figure of his time, and may be regarded as indicating a very self-conscious and self-satisfied age, convinced that its greatness outshone all earlier generations, and determined to work out all the new improvements which its fortune and its talents had produced. As Alexander was greater than Brasidas or Pericles, so these early Diadochi assumed that in every respect they had outdone their forerunners. They were full of life and energy, like the men of the Italian Renaissance, and far removed from that mere looking-back which is so striking in the later generations, and which so strongly reminds us of the pre-Raphaelitism of our own century. They did not consider their art an after-bloom, as we do, for on their coins, which had images of the gods, they reproduced not the venerable and majestic types of former days, but the new creations of the modern school, supple and beautiful, but rather effective than impressive, and showing the worldliness which had invaded Greek religion. So too in architecture, they preferred the rich grace of the Corinthian order, and became the teachers of the great Roman builders, who appropriated this idea perfectly, while the older and severer schools were always strange to them. So it was in poetry, as we shall see more fully in considering Alexandria, the principal exponent of this age. The earlier Roman poets imitated almost exclusively the Hellenistic poets, and it was not till the Augustan age that with Greek pre-Raphaelitism came in the worship of older and purer models. Pompeian wall-decoration shows the same influences, so that we are

[1] Strabo p. 641. This proposal was hardly absurd to the man who undertook to rebuild the town of Bel at Babylon, 620 feet high, and 600 square at its base.—Strabo p. 629.

justified in saying that the age was a great and fruitful age, in which there were many successful men—kings, politicians, soldiers, artists, merchants—who were strong enough to swim in troubled waters, and lived a life full of excitement and enjoyment.

But what about the many failures? What about those who had not this enterprise, or the capital to undertake the keen money speculations which brought back a hundred-fold? What about those whose serious views of life hated display and working for effect? Where can we get evidence on the life of these quieter or idler or unluckier sections of society? What about the frivolous and the unfortunate?

We have information concerning the extremes of this large residuum of society—the best and the worst of those who did not shine in the public life and richness of the age. The one is represented by the philosophers and their schools, the other in the genteel comedy of the day. I shall consider the latter first.

At no epoch of history does the separation of style and matter strike us more forcibly. Immense new fields of physical inquiry, of strange history, of oriental wonder, of mystical religion, were disclosed to the Greeks. And there was no lack of men who endeavoured to conquer these fields for Greek curiosity and for Hellenistic culture. But the sense of style, and the care for it, seem unable to coexist with this opening of great sluice-gates of new information. We see it plainly enough in Aristotle, whose extant works show a contempt of style astonishing in the pupil of Plato and contemporary of Demosthenes.[1] And so the historians from

[1] Cicero, indeed, speaks of Aristotle's *Dialogues* (now lost) as flowing in a golden stream of eloquence, but I think it more likely that, having attempted to understand the philosopher and having failed, he still wished to pose as knowing all about him, and based his judgments of Aristotle on the general reputation he possessed as a thinker, and which

this time onwards seem to have lost either all love of good style or all appreciation of it. So also with the philosophers, whom we shall discuss presently, plain directness and clearness was the object, nor did they discover that to attempt to write clearly, without careful training in style, is like attempting to act naturally on the stage without the most careful study. It is only the artist in literature who writes naturally and clearly. Hence these philosophers exhibited, indeed, their contempt for style, but at the cost not only of all grace but often of that very clearness which they affected.

I anticipate these points in order to illustrate the very opposite taste in the comic writers and later orators who attended to style only. For the object of these men, who no doubt regarded themselves as the preservers of Hellenic purity from the invading corruption of Macedonian and Persian influences, was to avoid all fields of new matter, and to show their skill by repeating with varied elegance the same trite and well-worn ideas. One cannot but be reminded in this connexion of the 'pure scholars' of the present day, who go on re-editing Aeschylus and Sophocles and Thucydides with dreary iteration, each fancying that by two or three minute additions or variations in criticism he has done great things for the advance of human culture. The later rhetoricians, beginning with Demetrius Phalereus, thought they had done splendid work if they adorned an old commonplace of thought with some new tinsel; and, if they turned to history, neglected research and critical judgment for the sake of the 'purple rags' which they sewed on their narrative. But the orators failed signally in

Cicero could hardly conceive to be true without implying fine style. The new *Polity of the Athenians*, if it be Aristotle's, is by no means remarkable for its style, though it differs sensibly from the other extant treatises ascribed to him.

the very thing they affected. They added nothing to the thought of the world, and even degraded the very style of Greek writing. The comic writers did not fail so signally. The grace of Menander and his contemporaries, though not attaining to the highest bloom of the great Attic days, was yet very perfect grace, and as stylists they were not only pre-eminent in their day, but contributed not a little to the perfection of Latin literature by guiding the Latin playwrights. We owe Terence to Menander.

But when all has been said that ought to be, or can be, in praise of Menander's style, and when we come to inquire from him and from the New Comedy what they have to tell us about their age, the outcome is miserably small. They appear carefully to avoid all the great events of the day, all large political interests, all serious philosophy, and merely to reflect the idlest, the most trivial, and the most decayed gentility of Athens. They do not even invent new scenery, new framework to convey their elegancies to the audience. Starting from a commonplace as old as Aristophanes, the 'rape and recognition' of some respectable and therefore wholly insignificant girl, or from the passion for some girl in the hands of a procurer, they added a few other stock characters—the young and fashionable spendthrift, the morose and stingy father, the indulgent uncle, the threadbare parasite, the harpy courtesan, and by ringing the changes upon these constituents of decayed and idle Attic society produced a whole literature of graceful talk, polite immorality, selfish ethics, and shallow character. It is usual to lament the irreparable loss of the plays of Menander, but it may be doubted whether, apart from style, history would gain from a further knowledge of him. We have his sentiments, and those of Diphilus and Philemon, in hundreds of fragments; we have rude copies, too rude to

imply alterations of much import in substance, in the collection of Plautine plays, and in Terence. We may feel confident that, except by some stray allusion, the rest would have told us little more of the history, the manners, or the real life of the age.

This generality of treatment, this absence of local colour, this avoidance of the special interests of the age—this it is which has given the New Comedy its popularity among widely different ages and people. Thus the rude and barbarous Romans, though their society was infinitely purer, and in other respects at total variance with that implied in the New Comedy, could nevertheless understand the miser and the spendthrift, the sceptic and the superstitious, the matron and the courtesan there painted in their universal characteristics; while the plays of Aristophanes, or even the literary and philosophical criticism of the so-called middle comedy, were to them wholly unintelligible. Even later Greeks like Plutarch felt this, and knew that, while Aristophanes was only to be fully understood by those who understood Periclean Athens, the later comedy might be acted at Antioch or Alexandria or Seleucia on the Tigris as well as in Greece. And yet with this quasi-philosophical generality, how narrow it all was! If, instead of bitter and scurrilous allusions to great personages,[1] which were frequent enough, and innuendoes against virtue and morals, they had boldly painted Demetrius the Besieger, or the Philosopher, or

[1] Polybius, in refuting the scandalous charges of Timaeus against Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes, the chief of the anti-Macedonian party at Athens, mentions (xii. 13, 7) that Timaeus had cited the comic poet Archedicus as his authority, and urges that the libels of the poet were not confirmed by the writings of the friends of Antipater and his policy, of whom there were many, especially Demetrius Phalereus. Cf. also, on the political complexion of the New Comedy, Meineke *Hist. Crit. Com. Graec.* p. 436.

Casander's pedant brother, or the conceited artists of the day, what far deeper instruction they would have left us! Their personages are like the ingenious variations of second-rate composers upon a well-known melody, which exhibit grace and ingenuity, but enrich us with no new feeling. A single national air, with its inexpressible charm of distinct local colour—in fact of originality—is worth a whole world of these variations.

The same criticism applies to the tract known as the *Characters* of Theophrastus, a book far more praised than it deserves.[1] In the form now extant it gives a series of portraits of various social vices—all of them forms of littleness or meanness such as are the characteristics of a shabby and idle society. Moreover, the drawing of these characters is not psychologically subtle, as is often asserted. The features brought out are rather those intended for stage characters [2] than those drawn from a careful observation of real life. The book has to me the air of a treatise not copied from the New Comedy, as has been suggested, but rather composed as a handbook of characters for a young author intending to write such comedies. It was then the fashion to have recourse to philosophers, and to take their advice on most matters of life. They were supposed to know human character better than their neighbours. Menander himself, though his practical philosophy was distinctly that of his friend Epicurus, studied in this very Peripatetic school of

[1] Its authenticity and value is best defended by my able friend Prof. Gomperz in his essay on the book in *Sitzb. Acad. Vienna* vol. cxvii. (1888), Essay x.

[2] How far the fourth book of Aristotle's *Ethics* may have been intended to give sketches of real life, is not easy to say. The famous portrait of the μεγαλόψυχος seems to me more of a stage character than anything else. 'His voice must be deep, and his step slow' seems to me very like a theatrical suggestion. But so large and controversial a question must be adjourned to another occasion.

Theophrastus, whose distinctive feature was the attention to *natural history* of every kind, from stones and plants to piety and pride. So Bolingbroke drew up on human nature a series of propositions which Pope undertook to adorn with his splendid style in the famous *Essay on Man*. But in the *Characters* it is the nature of man as shown in an idle and decaying provincial society—the passions and pursuits of people with no public spirit or interests; the virtues are omitted, even the stronger vices, and all the changes rung upon the foibles and vulgarities of everyday life.

This tedious itching to describe types equally infects the fragments of a tour in Greece left us under the name of Dicaearchus.[1] The writer not only professes to give a distinct character to the inhabitants of each town he names in Boeotia, but even draws distinctions of this kind between the people of Attica and the Athenians. Such refinements might be serviceable for a stage bound by the shackles of tradition. In a would-be observer of real life it leads us to doubt his accuracy in cases where a real distinction existed.

Through the troubled medium of Plautus, as well as through the more colourless Terence, we can perfectly well recover what types of life were represented on the Attic stage. Any personal allusions indeed, which would have told us some of the history of political feeling, are left out. Perhaps the plays which had a little more than the slightest local colour were not translated by the Latin copyists, who could not postulate in their audience any knowledge of Eastern history. But all the personages, the scenes, the manners of the *comoedia palliata* of the Romans were Attic. If then we were to believe these elaborate studies of manners in Alexander's and his successors' days, the life of youth con-

[1] Müller *FHG* ii. 254 *sq.*

sisted in drinking and wenching, in squandering money, nay even in committing the worst kind of felonious assault without even the punishment of much remorse. The young man who is strictly brought up has to stay in the country and help to mind the farm. But how complete and oppressive an exile this was considered appears from a curious comparison in the tourist just cited (c. 4): 'To sum up, *as far as the rest of cities surpass the country for the pleasure and the right use of life*, so far again does Athens exceed them.'

Accordingly the sympathy of the audience is warmly enlisted for the oppressed youth who escapes by stratagem from his watchful father, and comes to spend a night of debauchery in the city. He does this too with the connivance of elders, and through the machinations of a 'faithful' slave. For old men are divided into two opposed classes. The one is thrifty, morose, hard, censorious; the other indulgent, generous, lax in morals. If two old men appear in a play they are generally brothers, and generally opposed in this way. The mothers of the house are either imperious heiresses, who lead their weak and sneaking husbands no pleasant life, or more respectable ciphers, the mothers of girls who innocently fell into the most serious mischief, and are only saved from ruin by what an Irish judge called 'the fortuitous interference of Providence.' If the attending of night festivals was (as the stock incident of these plays implies) so disastrous to the character of respectable girls, one is at a loss to imagine how any Attic father or mother should have allowed it. We may therefore fairly assume that this theatrical commonplace, though not unheard of, was almost as rare in real life as it is now in connexion with religious night services It is certainly no mirror of ordinary Greek life.

I wish I could affirm that the frequent cases of exposed

children, especially girls, brought up by the worst kind of slave-dealers, were equally rare in real life. But with the increase of both wealth and poverty in these stormy days, when the requirements of genteel life were greater, and the means of meeting them not forthcoming, the exposing of female infants may have been one of the causes contributing to the alarming decrease of population in the next century. For though it may have been so far humanely contrived that the infant seldom perished, those who saved it from death were not likely to do so for the purpose of hereafter making it the mother of a family. Still there is one circumstance about this matter of exposal which makes me suspect its frequency. In all the plays and fragments we have I cannot remember a case occurring *during the action of the play*. There is no case, for example, of the finding of such a child, when exposed by its desolate and ruined young mother, leading to its recognition by the peccant father, and its consequent rehabilitation. There is no lamentation that when such a child is born it will have to be exposed. All the cases of exposal mentioned are in the past, and happened far away.[1] Have we then before us merely another fiction of the stage?

So strict was the adherence of all Greek art, even the best and greatest, to fixed models, that if one great master sanctioned this device we may be certain to find hundreds of direct imitations, and so the pedants of after days are led away to state as natural, or as ordinary, what is really the invention of a single brain. In all our social inferences from Greek literature caution on this point is of capital importance. Thus every heiress in the plays is imperious,

[1] It is not till the days of the last death-struggle of Greece that we have from Polybius a statement which seems to imply such a practice as ordinary. To this we shall return in due time.

disagreeable, disgusting to her husband, often indeed only because she will not tolerate his immoralities. Of course there were at Athens and throughout Greece plenty of amiable heiresses—thousands who had not bowed the knee to Mammon. If we believe the New Comedy there were none. So also there is no colour in any profession save one. The skippers who come into port from foreign parts are all the same. The soldiers are all the same—cowards, braggarts, and defeated in love. Menander declared by the mouth of one of his characters that not even the gods, if they tried, could produce a polished soldier. Yet in that day, when the profession was the leading one of Greece, there must have been plenty of soldiers of fortune similar in type to Xenophon, and far more cultivated by travel and experience than their Attic critics. But the use of an un-Attic form, or a local name not recognised at Athens, would be enough in Menander's day to set them down as boors. And so Menander himself and his fellows met their just reward at the hands of the pedants, who have set down with implacable severity the list of forms wherein even the exquisitely polished dialogue of the New Comedy had degenerated from the classical perfection, the *prisca ars loquendi* of Plato and Aristophanes.

But let us pass from these lay figures in the New Comedy to the only profession treated with real variety, and with a living appreciation of its various phases. In the courtesans of this theatre we have at last something real. There was a whole gallery of them in Menander and his fellows, and from the extant fragments and imitations we can see that there was real interest in their sayings and doings at Athens, even if we did not know that there was a special treatise about them in the next generation which furnished Athenaeus with most of the gossip in his thirteenth book.

There was no doubt one side prominent in this book which Menander's refinement could not tolerate, their ribald talk, and so far his pictures were incomplete. But we have the queen-courtesan, Thais, whom he calls his Muse to celebrate—splendid, fascinating, heartless, ruinous, a leading figure in Athenian life; we have the inferior and coarser species, the Philenium of the *Asinaria*, who has her preferences, but is quite content to be handed over for a day to her favourite's father, and enters into the fracas between the old sinner and his indignant wife with comic and brutal naïveté. We have the slave of circumstance, whose career is marked out by hard fate, and who is better than her infamous profession, nay, we have even a sort of Attic *Dame aux Camélias*, the Bacchis of the *Hecyra*, who sacrifices her own interests for the sake of her lover, and acts as the good angel of the house, smoothing difficulties, and promoting his respectable marriage and settlement in life.

Of all the pictures of courtesans, this is perhaps the most morally reprehensible, though the least offensive, for whatever virtues there may be connected with this kind of vice, it is the duty of the stage not to erect such exceptional or accidental cases into a type. Thus men of experience among the Menandrian society of our day tell us that of all the immoral novels produced by the French, Dumas' *Dramatic Apology*, just named, is the most mischievous and far-reaching in its effects.

Far more disgusting than even these portraits in the New Comedy are the many pictures of immoral old age, of fathers indulging their sons in vice, and conniving at it, nay, worse, taking part in it, in the presence of their sons. The mere mention of such a thing is more than enough for modern readers, and I will merely append in a note the argument of Plautus's *Asinaria*, to remind classical scholars

of the facts.[1] The apologies of the *Grex* at the end of this play, and of the *Bacchides*, for the conduct of the old men, are exhibitions of the very worst epicureanism 'of the stage,' and we may indeed wonder how the solid Romans of the second Punic war, a great and sound society, could have tolerated such pictures of vice as would have been thought outrageous if occurring at Rome. How could the Fabii, the Aurelii, the Marcelli of that day endure that their youth should be made intimate with the society of courtesans, as a part of elegance and culture? It would be irrelevant here to discuss this question. Suffice it to say that we now tolerate in book-shops and even on our tables French novels which, if printed in English, would be subject to prosecution by the law, and which no respectable bookseller would venture to advertise. Recently the English people even fêted in London one of the worst authors in infamous literature. In some such way the Romans may have tolerated in the *comoedia palliata* things which would have been revolting to them if represented as Italian.

What we have said concerning the evidence of comedy about the age of the first Diadochi amounts to this: Menander and his successors—they lasted barely two generations —printed in a few stereotypes a small and very worthless society at Athens. There was no doubt a similar set of people at Corinth, at Thebes, possibly even in the city of Lycurgus. These people, idle, for the most part rich, and

[1] Senex D. vivens sub legibus uxoris Artemonae, optat favere amoribus Argyrippi filii data pecunia. Itaque D. mandat servo Pellaeo, qui afferebat pretium asinorum Saureae, a quo illos emerat, numerari illam pecuniam L. servo suo. Illa pecunia defertur ad Philenium amicam Argyrippi. Consentit Argyrippus Philenium esse una nocte cum D. patre. Diabolus rivalis et patris et filii, iratus ob praereptam amicam Philenium, detegit omnem rem A. uxori D. per suum parasitum. Artemona advolat, ac trahit D. maritum e lustro.

in good society, spent their earlier years in debauchery, and their later in sentimental reflections and regrets. They had no serious object in life, and regarded the complications of a love affair as more interesting than the rise and fall of kingdoms or the gain and loss of a nation's liberty. They were like the people of our day who spend all their time reading novels from the libraries, and who can tolerate these eternal variations in twaddle not only without disgust but with interest. They were surrounded with slaves, on the whole more intelligent and interesting, for in the first place slaves were bound to exercise their brains, and in the second they had a great object—liberty—to give them a keen pursuit in life. The relations of the sexes in this set or portion of society were bad, owing to the want of education in the women, and the want of earnestness in the men. As a natural consequence a class was found, apart from household slaves, who took advantage of these defects, and, bringing culture to fascinate unprincipled men, established relations which brought estrangements, if not ruin, into the home life of the day.[1]

But there were far lower classes in society, if not in morals, than these people, whom we might call the gentry

[1] In the ablest and most comprehensive book yet written on Hellenism, I mean the great work of Droysen, to which we are all so deeply indebted, there is a picture of Athens under Demetrius of Phaleron, which paints *its whole society* in these colours. Taking the scurrilous anecdotes about Demetrius in connexion with the fragments of Menander, and passing by Zeno and Epicurus with bare mention, he has drawn a brilliant sketch (ii. 2, 106 *sq.* in the new ed.), which is to my mind very one-sided, and therefore false. It is the main object of this and the next chapter to alter the impression he has produced. Indeed his account of Athens in the next generation (iii. 1, 228) is to me quite inconsistent with it. A people wholly given up to trivial and vicious living do not recover moral strength in a generation. But I must not further anticipate what I have to say.

of Athens. There were far larger masses in all the Greek towns more prominent, and therefore more easily judged. I do not speak of the parasites, another very small class which gained notoriety from the stage of Epicharmus rather than from real life, and so was copied for stage purposes till we have got to believe that parasites were as plenty as mendicants are now. The real parasites of Athens were not these few miserable starvelings, but the mob of Athens, the mass of free but poor citizens who had been taught by demagogues and by pretended patriots to depend not on their industry but on their politics for bread. They were taught the doctrine, not yet extinct, that the only way to make a poor people prosperous is by Autonomy, by driving out all foreign influences, by prohibiting foreign competition, and by letting people manage their own affairs. As every pauper then had a vote, we might well expect to find what has been already mentioned, that the use made of Home Rule was not to extend manufacture or trade, not to reward diligence and thrift, but to plunder the rich for the sake of the idle poor. Just as the tyrants of old had exiled and confiscated and murdered to obtain wealth, so the Democrats exiled and murdered and confiscated to enrich themselves; but finding, as is always the case, that riches so acquired have wings and fly away, they became the parasites of any foreign potentate who chose to subsidise them; they decreed divine honours to the man who sent them corn, and so we have the curious spectacle of men struggling incessantly for Home Rule, and yet grovelling in the dust before Foreign Rulers. The fact was that every time they got their sentimental panacea they found it an illusion and a snare. They could not be persuaded—what men can?—that their poverty and decadence were their own fault, but were ready to proclaim any foreign

cause as the source of their ills. So they were led to believe that some external influence foreign to their own thrift and character would restore them to prosperity. According to a now common formula, it 'would bring money into the country.' But we have yet to learn that there is a political alchemy which will create gold from dross, and transform by legislation the idle, the frivolous, and the dishonest into a prosperous and contented nation.

I will add that there were two important contributory causes which, both at Athens, and in a lesser degree throughout all the Greek cities, helped to do this social mischief. In the first place, the nation had always been, and was then, a nation of talkers, who delighted in eloquence and in the art of putting things forcibly and plausibly. It is a great mistake to think that this 'fatal fluency,' as it has been called in another connexion, acts only on the ignorant crowd. The speakers themselves come to be carried away as much as their audiences, and from long posing as patriots, gradually persuade themselves of the vital importance and the sincerity of their policy. Thus the knave gradually grows into the enthusiast, and the line of demarcation between the conscious seeking of profit by other people's folly and the belief in a mission is hardly to be determined. It is the same superfluity of insistence on a favourite idea which makes both speakers and populace hold on to it when it has long been proved idle, and parade as a national watch-word what they recognise individually to be an empty name.

Such was the game played with the words liberty and autonomy in the days when great Hellenistic empires were taking the place of the little independencies of former days. But the evils were increased by the second cause to which I have alluded—the apathy and indifference of the 'better'

classes. What wonder is it if in any age the ignorant and needy are misled, when those who have leisure for politics, and education to discern the truth, stand aloof in contempt, emigrate in disgust, or squander as idle absentees, or still idler residents, the time and means given them to benefit their country? We have just seen what the society of cultivated people at Athens was, as understood by the New Comedy. They had long lost all interest in politics, and perhaps naturally enough the recent loss of imperial powers made them feel how poor the duties of Greek citizens had become. But to recover a Hellenic federal empire cannot have seemed to them as impossible as we now know it to have been, and most certainly the total want of public spirit in the better classes was one of the worst signs of the future. They had even lost all taste for serious literature and high thinking. In the so-called middle comedy of the previous generation there is still some interest shown in philosophic systems, and even in schools of poetry—in fact, in the higher life of men apart from politics. But all this is gone from the theatres of the New Comedy. Idleness, frivolity, luxury, self-indulgence, are the attributes of the society which went to see its own reflection upon the stage. These people cared little whether Casander, Polyperchon, Demetrius, or Democharès ruled the agora, provided plenty of salt fish came from Pontus, fine wheat from Egypt, and the demi-monde kept them amused with their beauty and their wit. Accordingly the so-called mob, the ignorant and poorer classes, did not profit by that inestimable influence for good which can always be exercised upon them by an earnest and intellectual upper class.

The state of Athens in this respect was perhaps not above the average. There were certainly cities in which the upper classes were worse, as for example Thebes, where no public

business was done, where there was no intellectual life, even in the way of smart comedy, and where all men's money was spent in vulgar debauchery. The state of Argos also seems to have been very bad. But there were on the other hand cities where we may assume a far higher and more earnest aristocracy, which promoted art and culture if it did not lead in politics. Such was, I fancy, Megalopolis, as we may judge from the noble defence of its independence against Polyperchon's forces (B.C. 318), as well as from the traditions we see established there in the days of the Achaean League, beginning with the next generation. Such was also Sicyon, and perhaps other towns in Achaea; Sicyon, famed for its noble school of art, and its consequent close relations with the art-loving sovrans of the great new capitals. It is accordingly in these cities that the higher classes assert their influence, and form the new federal constitution in which rank and wealth so clearly predominated.

But it may be urged fairly enough that these cities did not suffer from a peculiar estrangement among their gentry, which is the most singular fact in the history of the Athens of our period. No doubt all Greek cities alike suffered from the emigration of the young and vigorous, who saw at home no scope for their energies, and who left Greece for ever to settle with honour and fortune in Alexandria, Antioch, and other leading cities of the East. There was another kind of loss which affected Athens more than the rest—the retirement of serious men into the schools, we might fairly say into the cloister, for such the Stoa was, at least in form. Phocion must have been almost alone in his attitude as a public man, persuaded of the hopelessness of any imperial policy, thoroughly at variance with the Home Rule cry, setting down its advocates as knaves and fools, surrounded by an envious, calumnious, thankless crowd,

and yet devoting all his life to their service with the calmness of a great despair, and imposing on them his authority by sublime honesty and stern self-denial. Any other man, perhaps even Phocion in a later generation, would have adopted one of two alternatives: he would have made himself a tyrant, doing it calmly and consciously for the good of the people, as did many enthusiastic and able men in the course of that century; or he would have abandoned public life altogether and retired into the shade to live a life of philosophic leisure. I said in a later generation, for in Phocion's ripeness, before he had become too old to do more than hold a straight course, neither had monarchy become so respectable as to throw its glamour upon self-constituted autocrats, nor had philosophy yet abandoned those subtle and dry speculations which must have repelled plain practical men. Plato, indeed, from the aristocratic exclusiveness of his temper, Aristotle, from the circumstances of his birth, had afforded examples of retirement from politics, together with great dignity and seriousness of life. But their books were far too abstruse; their system of life was far too complicated, and disguised in dry metaphysic, to attract men of mature years or of a non-speculative character.

In the generation before us all this was changed. Great practical systems of life had arisen, and persuaded, if not a large number, at least the most serious and valuable minds to give up public affairs and devote themselves to the pursuit of individual perfection and individual happiness.

CHAPTER VII

THE SERIOUS SIDE OF GREEK SOCIETY—THE RELIGION OF THE DAY

THERE is this great difficulty when we come to consider the serious elements which corresponded to the frivolous and ostentatious in this stormy time, that though the great practical systems of philosophy, and the establishment of philosophers as moral teachers, date from this generation, our accounts of these systems are not written till a long series of successors had added to, amended, and often depraved the teaching of the first great masters. Thus the explications and commentaries of Cleanthes and, still worse, of Chrysippus are now embodied with the lessons of Zeno, who was the original thinker whom we really desire to know; the bitter and scurrilous attacks on Epicurus, made by Stoic and other opponents of his school, well-nigh obscure the picture of that amiable sage, which we must pick out among contradictions and cavils; the scepticism of Pyrrho is joined to that of Timon the Sillograph, who is an important figure in the generation following the age of turmoil of the first Diadochi. Even the last and most minute historian of Greek philosophy, Zeller, has abandoned the task of separating what is due to each in these great schools, and Diogenes Laertius, our only

important ancient source who gives separate lives of them, evidently confuses later legends and anecdotes with what is genuine.

But there are a few simple facts which will show the reader the rapid and momentous change that took place in the social position and importance of philosophers at this transition time. Socrates, as we know, fell a victim to popular dislike, and to a strong conservative feeling in religion, which regarded his innovations in education and morals as dangerous to the state. Nor is there any truth in the legends, invented later on, of the remorse and repentance of the Athenians. Plato was of no political or practical importance in his day. His essays in public affairs were made at the tyrant court of Syracuse, and we never hear of his advice being offered, like that of Socrates, at any important public conjuncture at home. So Aristotle, however his advice may have influenced Alexander —I fancy very little indeed—had no more weight in politics than the head of an Oxford college has now. To his many pupils the Don was once a sort of demigod, perhaps afterwards a respected friend, but no cabinet minister now goes by the advice of his former scholastic directors, not even, I am sorry to add, in matters of education.

At the close of the fourth century B.C. we find a perfectly new state of things. Partly from thoughtful people turning to philosophy instead of politics, partly from the philosophers turning to ethical instead of metaphysical inquiry, there results an exaltation of philosophers into public importance such as has seldom been witnessed in the world's history.

Perhaps the earliest signal instance of this change is the story told by both Arrian and Plutarch of the murder of

Clitus by Alexander. When the king was shut up in his tent in a frenzy of despair, the first people who are sent in to console him, as the clergy would be summoned now, are two philosophers, Anaxarchus and Callisthenes, and we even hear that the line taken by Anaxarchus in his consolations—the assertion of the divine right of kings, that they can do no wrong—was thought immoral and injurious to the conqueror's after life. But this may have been invented to account for Alexander's growing orientalism. I think we have no reason to doubt the fact that philosophers were called in professionally to minister in cases of grief.[1]

We have again, in 322 B.C., three or four years later, an embassy sent under circumstances of great public danger to Antipater, when he insisted upon the extradition of the anti-Macedonian politicians at Athens. Such embassies had been sent to Philip and to Alexander before; but now we have a new kind of member—the venerable Xenocrates of Chalcedon, a *metic* at Athens, no citizen, but the head of Plato's Academy. He was regarded as the most weighty and venerable person next to Phocion at Athens, though he never appeared in the city, says Plutarch (*de exilio* 10), but one day in the year to see the new tragedies performed; all the rest of his time he spent in the retirement of the Academy. He was therefore no popular figure in the streets of Athens. The rude old Antipater, who was impatient of all Greeks, but above all of Greek philosophers, would not listen to him. The mission of Crates to King Demetrius,[2] a few years later, speaks the same kind of feeling,

[1] There are several cases of this in Descartes's correspondence, cited in my *Life of Descartes* (Blackwood, 1882), especially his letter to the Princess Elizabeth on the death of Charles I.

[2] The mission of Gorgias, *δημοσίᾳ οἴκοθεν πρεσβεύων*, if we can trust

and introduced a permanent fashion, of which the best known case is the visit of the three philosophers in the middle of the next century to Rome when Carneades produced so profound an impression.[1] It is analogous to the mission of the Christian bishop from mediaeval towns to treat with an enraged conqueror.

Here then was a growing power so strongly felt that there was one more public attempt made by the extreme democratic party to shackle it by law. For we cannot hear of any philosopher of any school who favoured the mob. All the advanced thinkers adopted and defended the idea of royalty so repugnant to the older Greeks. Accordingly the democracy, as restored by Demetrius the Besieger, adopted the proposal of a certain Sophocles, that under pain of death no one should keep a philosophical school except with the consent of council and popular assembly. This was accepted as a decree of banishment, at least by the Peripatetic school. We are assured that at this time Theophrastus, the successor of Aristotle, had 2000 hearers, but we cannot tell whether his advocacy of an old doctrine was not more popular than the newer and more original lectures of Zeno and Epicurus. In any case there was a great exodus of philosophers. Within one year, we are told, the proposer of the law was prosecuted by an adherent of Theophrastus (or Aristotle), and though defended by Demosthenes's nephew, Democharés, the leading democrat of the day, was fined and his law repealed. The comic poets, the

the *Hippias Maior* of Plato, would be an earlier case, occurring in 427 B.C., not to speak of the political importance of Empedocles and Pythagoras. It has been suggested to me that the new fashion was really the renascence of an old custom, which the political age of Athens and Sparta had superseded.

[1] Cf. *Greek World under Roman Sway* p. 68.

mouthpieces of the frivolous people, were against the philosophers.[1]

Why was this law so suddenly repealed? The law itself was indeed one of those spasmodic conservative efforts made at intervals by the Athenian democracy to protect themselves from a danger which they habitually overlooked —that of free discussion in matters of ethics and religion. The usual practice of the democracy was to avoid all interference with the philosophers, though the prosecution of Socrates, Protagoras, and Diagoras, the law of Critias under the Thirty Tyrants, and the present action show that it nevertheless asserted the right of interference. And as this right was never disputed, we are disposed to seek some striking change of politics to account for the repeal of Sophocles's law. But as no such cause presents itself, I cannot but conjecture that as the Athenians were then in that sorry plight when people give up working for themselves, and look to legislation or to accidental circumstances to support them, when they forget that industry is the real source of wealth, and hail tourists or foreign princes as bringing them money—to such people the banishment of the philosophers would entail the disappearance of some thousands of pupils, many of them foreigners, who spent their money in Athens. Hence I conceive the reversal of Sophocles's decree to have been caused by no higher motive than money considerations.

But however this may be, the statement that King Lysimachus of Thrace likewise banished all philosophers

[1] Diog. Laert. v. ii. § 38; Athenaeus xiii. 610 e quotes from Alexis:

τοῦτ' ἔστιν Ἀκαδήμεια, τοῦτο Ξενοκράτης;
πόλλ' ἀγαθὰ δοῖεν οἱ θεοὶ Δημητρίῳ
καὶ τοῖς νομοθέταις, διότι τοὺς τὰς τῶν λόγων,
ὥς φασι, δυνάμεις παραδιδόντας τοῖς νέοις
ἐς κόρακας ἔρρειν φασὶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς.

from the cities of his kingdom[1] corroborates our view of these men's importance, even though we find it hard to understand his policy. With this rude soldier, who had committed terrible crimes in his old age, and within his family circle, it may have been the out-speaking of the philosophers which led him to regard them as Herod did John Baptist. That he knew well enough the power of words, we may conclude from the statement that he subsidised a comic poet at Athens to write down his enemy King Demetrius.[2]

We hear that a direct accusation for impiety was made by Agnonides against Theophrastus, which also failed,[3] and so

[1] Athenaeus xiii. 610 e.

[2] Plutarch *Demetrius* 26.

[3] If we may trust Bernays's reconstruction of the *Tract on Piety* (περὶ εὐσεβείας) from the quotations of Porphyry, Theophrastus was indeed a dangerous opponent of orthodoxy. For he there argued that the whole system of sacrificing animals was both offensive in itself and inconsistent with true piety. It violated the obligation of general benevolence towards other living things, it substituted occasional and costly acts of religious service for the daily duty of worshipping the gods, and replaced the pure and natural gifts (of the fruits of the earth) by a gross and bloody gift, merely invented to cloak the gluttony of the sacrificers, who invariably feasted upon the victim, and therefore selected not the cleanest but the most palatable beasts. Theophrastus appears as a vegetarian, allowing no slaughter of animals unless they be harmful to men. How this attack on sacrifices must have offended the orthodox, I need hardly insist; it is notable as evidence of the Rationalism or *Aufklärung* which had taken place in religion, for it seems to have made no great stir in the world. Let me add here an interesting case of Rationalism even in the Delphic oracle. Hegesander the Delphian (Athenaeus ix. 400) says that in the days of Antigonus Gonatas there grew such a multitude of hares (possibly rabbits?) in the island of Astypalaea that the inhabitants sent to consult the oracle what they should do. They were simple and believing people. The oracle advised them—not to make prayer and sacrifices and offerings to the gods, but—to keep dogs and to take to hunting; and so they killed 6000 of their tormentors, and saved their pasture. We may imagine the amusement of people with modern notions when

we seem to hear an echo of the last struggle of the old traditions against the new schools of thought. From henceforth all opinion is free at Athens; even Epicurus, with his hardly-veiled atheism; Zeno, with his monotheism; the sceptics with their disturbing logic—all are not only tolerated, but enjoy high position and social respect at Athens. We have the text in Diogenes of a decree giving Zeno the Stoic—a stranger from Cyprus—public laudation and the honour of a public tomb. We have the rights of citizenship constantly offered to these men. We see them the friends of kings. We find them the advisers of politicians. And this happened at a time when the historians of philosophy tell us that original genius had decayed, that Plato and Aristotle had left no successors worthy the name, and that philosophy had become the recreation of the idle, and not the study of the sage.

All this is to me a false way of looking at things; the age of the Diadochi was not that of decadence, but of splendour in the practical philosophy of the Greeks.

For, first of all, the audience was completely changed. Instead of attracting only the idle and the rich, who had time for metaphysic and taste for refinement both of manners and of thought, we find the once elegant society of Plato recruited in the newer schools from men of low birth, of poor extraction, of foreign accent, of ungainly

this reply was issued to the formal and solemn inquiry of the islanders. Strabo (iii. 2, 6) speaks of a similar plague, and certainly of rabbits, in the Balearic Isles, when the inhabitants appealed not to the oracle but to the Romans. But Strabo speaks of rabbits as peculiar to the West beyond Massilia. Xenophon in his tract on hunting the hare never mentions or describes rabbits. It appears now from the researches of Erhardt, quoted by Heldreich (Murray *Greece* p. 31), that both hares and rabbits are common in the Aegean, but inhabit separate islands, in Andros alone separate parts of the same island. This is very odd, seeing that they live together in perfect harmony with us.

appearance.[1] From these come the great masters of the schools. We find them beginning to teach in other cities, Elis, Eretria, Megara, Colophon, and bringing an acquired reputation with them to Athens, as a German professor now advances from Greifswald or Marburg to Berlin.

We may also be quite certain that the inner quality of their audience underwent far deeper changes. I have said already that a large part of the able and energetic youth went off to foreign military and civil service. But there were others weak of body, wanting in physical energy, detained by family circumstances, or even by the contempt of mere money-making, who were driven to abandon all contact with public life by the crime and the misery of the times. Whether it was the educated luxury of Demetrius the philosopher, or the wild debaucheries of Demetrius the king, the stupid raving of Demochares the patriot, or the coarse ribaldry of Demades the opportunist, public affairs became equally disgusting to sober and thoughtful minds. It meant the mastery of the brutal mob, the furious exile, the rude Macedonian satrap, or the old tyrant in the sheep's clothing of a deliverer. Who could tolerate public life under such circumstances? The public decrees were a series of begging letters, grovelling votes of thanks, blood-thirsty acts of vengeance, pretended outbursts of patriotism, which never represented, and could not represent, the sober and solid classes at Athens. There were many souls above all these things, with no scope for their life, no consolation for their leisure but to escape from this vulgarity and this

[1] Cf. the story in Cicero's *Brutus* 46: *Illud Theophrasto accidisse, quum percontaretur ex anicula quadam, quanti aliquid venderet, et respondisset illa atque addidisset, Hospes, non pote minoris: tulisse eum moleste, se non effugere hospitis speciem, quum aetatem ageret Athenis optimeque loqueretur.*

crime into a purer, calmer atmosphere. To all such the schools were a haven of rest.

This is not the place to give an exposition of their systems. Any adequate account of either Zeno's or Epicurus's philosophy, travelling as they did over every field of knowledge and embracing every science, would require a volume, and a reader specially versed in philosophy to follow it. For it is quite wrong to suppose that these thinkers, busy as they were with practical life, despised or avoided speculation. Their philosophical theories demand hard reading and hard thinking, which is all the more remarkable, as these were only with them the means to an end—practical happiness, not an end in themselves, as they had been to Plato and Aristotle.

It was indeed this speculativeness in both these famous forerunners which gave Zeno and Epicurus their advantage. Plato's poetic vision and splendid generalisations had been supplanted by the minute observations and myriad diligence of his rival Aristotle, but neither the synthesis of the one nor the analysis of the other had made men happier. Neither the one ideal republic of Plato, nor the 158 actual polities of Aristotle, with all his acute speculation on the causes of their growth and decay, had affected in aught the course of Hellenic history. The one had never come into existence, the others had been absorbed by monarchies, and the old duties of free citizens had well-nigh disappeared. People felt the hunger for a deeper faith, a surer hope, a larger charity than were afforded by Hellenic politics and Hellenic sympathies.

It redounds to the eternal credit of that wonderful race, that without a revelation from above, without an inspiration from within, they found by their reason the right solution of these new and burning problems. Their moral systems

brought out into perfect and permanent day the majesty of duty, the splendour of devotion, the dignity of self-denial; they explained how contentment was real liberty, and passion the sorest bondage. Above all, the individual, not the state, was the unit and the whole with which each man had to reckon, and no public calamities, no national afflictions, no change of laws or constitutions, could rob him of that absolute spiritual freedom which is within the reach of every educated mind.

The silent antagonism to both Plato and Aristotle is not more remarkable in these schools than their return to older thinkers, whose views they adopted and developed, not without the aid of those recent predecessors whom they despised. As regards physics they revolted from the spiritualism of Plato and Aristotle to adopt the cruder and easier doctrines of Heraclitus or Democritus; as regards morals they felt that the true descendants of the great master, Socrates, were not the learned and speculative masters of the Academy and the Lyceum, but the outspoken and rude Antisthenes, and the equally outspoken but polished Aristippus. These men had seized the practical sides of Socrates — Antisthenes, his absolute liberty of spirit and free-thinking, even to a complete break with existing society; Aristippus, his principle that happiness was the first object of man, and that a philosophy which did not take account of pleasure was no adequate rule of life.

But these two men had been almost isolated thinkers, coming before their time, while the Greek State still overshadowed the individual, and they were obscured by the great theorists who deduced the perfection of individual life from the perfection of the state. But now Zeno took up Antisthenes's philosophy; he enlarged its basis and its

interest by great physical and cosmical speculations; he reckoned with vulgar orthodoxy in religion, not as the other had done, by blunt scepticism, but by ingenious allegory and large pantheism, embracing all local creeds; and so he became a power in society and the author of a permanent school of thought, instead of spending his life as an offensive vagrant or as a surly recluse. And now Epicurus took up Aristippus's theory of pleasure, purified it from its grosser sensuality, enlarged it with theories of the world and of knowledge, stood aside from the popular religion without declared controversy, substituted personal friendship for the decaying bond of patriotism, and so created a theory of life which lasts fresh to the present day.

All competent historians of philosophy have noted how similar in character and aim these bitterly opposed schools proved themselves. Both sought the attainment of the *summum bonum* or supreme happiness. Both asserted it to be attainable in this life, but only by the true sage. Zeno started from a large conception of the universe, ruled by the laws of a Divine providence, and exhorted his hearers to ascertain and conform to these laws, promising perfect happiness to him who regenerated his soul by following the great voice of nature, by obeying the will of God in His ordering of the world. Thus the Stoic sage became the forerunner of the Puritan; he was suddenly, sometimes even unconsciously, transformed from one of the world, from a fool in the Old Testament sense, to a state of wisdom or grace differing *in kind* from his former state. He was absolutely free, for no power could shackle his mind, and he would leave his body like a garment in the hands of the tyrant if imprisonment or torture assailed his happiness. Nay, he was rich with unfailing treasure,

though an-hungered; he was a king, though in the condition of a slave.[1] He held the doctrine of Assurance in the highest degree, and as the sage was incapable of sin, so the righteousness of the fool was but filthy rags, his virtue dross, his knowledge utter ignorance. Thus while this doctrine preached the total insignificance of the single man in the ordering of the world, and his duty to submit to the law of providence, and to regard any poor, painful, distressing place allotted to him as the best and happiest state; on the other hand the lofty position given to the sage rehabilitated individual rights, and made it lawful for the philosopher to interfere and even to command in politics. Plato's *Republic* is trenchant and despotic enough in its control of private life, but what was it to the *Republic* of Zeno? For Diogenes Laertius tells us[2] that 'at the very opening of the treatise he declared all the received systems of education to be useless, and next that all those who were not good men were adversaries and enemies and slaves and foreigners, even parents to their children and brethren to their brethren and relatives to their relatives; and again that the good only were citizens and friends and relatives and free, so that parents and their children are mutual enemies if they be not *wise*. Again he says that wives shall be common property, both in his *Republic* and in his *200 Verses*, and that neither temples nor law-courts nor gymnasia shall be built in his city. About coined money he writes that it should not be provided either for

[1] There is no mistaking the Stoical training of St. Paul in the splendid periods where he gives all these formulae a newer and deeper meaning, *e.g.* 'as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.'—2 Cor. vi. 8 *sq.*

[2] vii. 1, §§ 32 *sq.*

the sake of exchange or to assist the absenteeism of citizens; and as to dress, that men and women should wear the same costume, and that no part of the person need be concealed.'[1]

From such a system only can we explain the many *respectable* tyrants of the succeeding century, men who felt convinced that they knew perfectly what was good for their fellows, and held in a new sense that the philosopher was indeed the only competent king. They felt it lawful to seize supreme power, even by violent means, though their singleness of heart and honesty of purpose were sometimes shown when they found in practice that their theory would not work, and when they consequently resigned their sovranty. But the contempt of torture and death also made Stoics very dangerous advocates of liberty, for if convinced that the removal of a tyrant was in accordance with the will of God, no regard for personal safety restrained them.

Thus in many directions, often inconsistent in principle and contradictory in effect, the Stoic theory stimulated the individual will, the power of personality, the assertion of conscience without regard to consequences. And if we justly wonder at such a system arising in a sensitive, pleasure-loving, dishonest, pliable, selfish race, the answer is clear enough. In the first place, the intellectual fascination of such a theory was in those days intense. It justified the thoughtful despot, and gave him a patent of royalty such as he had never before possessed in Greece. It consoled the desolate or the oppressed, for it taught him that the accidents

[1] The trenchant character of this work caused it to be suspected as spurious, but Chrysippus declared it genuine. Zeno's speculations on sexual relations were such that the Stoic editors at Pergamum expurgated their edition, but they were detected, and the offensive passages were afterwards restored. Its coarseness is noted as worse than that of Epicurus by Plutarch *Symp.* iii. qu. 2, § 1.

and misfortunes of his life were but trifles, which were as nothing to the royal liberty of his faith. It comforted the politician, who saw the collapse of old and honoured liberties, the decay of Hellenic states, the invasion of Macedonian and oriental manners.

But when we touch upon these foreign elements, we reach the strongest side of Stoicism. The founder, and the great majority of its leaders, came not from Greece, nor even from Hellenic Asia, but from the rough and mountainous Cilicia, and from Cyprus, where Hellenic blood was deeply affected by oriental races. The mystic side of Stoicism, its pantheism and its allegory, as well as the calm resignation which it preached, bear evident traces of oriental imagination and oriental patience. This philosophy was therefore one of the first results, and perhaps the greatest, of Hellenism proper—the reaction upon Hellenedom of the thought and culture of the East.

The quietism of Epicurus was more Greek in its character, more logical too, and practical, and so within the reach of the large number of average people who could not grasp the ideal of Zeno. But it was also liable to grave misconstructions, and was denounced from the beginning as an apology for panders, parasites, and prostitutes. Yet nothing could be purer and more Stoical than Epicurus's own life. He started, indeed, not from duty, but from the pursuit of pleasure, which he regarded as the law of every being, ordained by nature as the spring of all action. But he took care to show by his life and doctrine that pleasures of sense are fleeting, and, when excessive, involve great consequent pains, that our interest, when rightly understood, leads us to prefer mental to bodily pleasure—the delights of memory, of imagination, and of hope, to the tumults of passion.

Thus virtue came to be identical with the longest and greatest pleasure, and duty coincided with interest. He declared also that the happiness of the wise man was independent of fortune, and even compatible with poverty and pain. He divided scanty rations among his pupils with perfect contentment during the famine of a long siege. He asserted his perfect happiness when dying slowly of an agonising disease. Though he regarded the basis of friendship to be mutual profit, no one was more sentimental in his attachments.[1] This is indeed the most prominent feature in the long and explicit account of his life and writings left us by Diogenes Laertius. We see too in the great poem of Lucretius with what majesty this advocacy of pleasure could be stated. But in the day of its birth, the real moment of the doctrine lay in its satisfying the want of that other kind of mind which revolts from Stoicism, which desires a clear reason, and a practical one, for every action, which desires to get rid of false theory and traditional wisdom, which is sick of politics and discontented with traditional faith, and yet will not be satisfied with mere scepticism. To such tame unpoetical natures Epicurus offered a system based directly on what they could see and feel, on the pursuit of such satisfaction as they all understood, on the putting aside of religion as a system of control or a source of fear, and supplanting it with a scientific creed, a large and distinct body of doctrine.

[1] Upon this Wilamowitz (*Antigonus of Karystos* p. 93, note) has well remarked, that it met one of the chief tendencies of the age. It was a day when other bonds among men had given way, when patriotism felt itself all astray, when the ties of family and of creed were loosened. Then it was that the eternal ineradicable bond of personal sympathy and of personal attachment came into the foreground, and was embraced even by such a system as that of Epicurus, which logically seemed to contradict it.

For this too is to be noted in that age, that it was not prepared for trenchant scepticism. Such a system was tried by Pyrrho of Elis, but in spite of his followers, Timon and Aenesidemus, he made no large school and left but small traces on Greek thought.[1] The days were not yet come when the Platonists turned sceptics and brought the world round with them; it was still the age of positive teaching, of a firm belief that knowledge was attainable, of the substitution of philosophic creeds for the old religions. Second-rate people went in crowds to the second-rate successors of Plato and Aristotle, whose schools were now well established at Athens. But Xenocrates and Theophrastus could only lead such men as Demetrius of Phaleron, or Menander, and what they taught was not life but learning. Hence we may be sure that if the lesser number frequented the Stoa or the Garden, to hear men who were strangers in birth or in education, but stranger still in their creed, these few were indeed the solid and thoughtful minds of the day.

It is not at Athens only, but in many cities of Greece—at Corinth, Elis, Colophon, Heraclea in Pontus—that this sober and serious teaching made men look away from the folly, the turmoil, the war which racked the Hellenic world for forty years, to what true and solid satisfaction was still attainable. The Greek who had lost his autonomy politically regained it spiritually, and reasserted this new and greater liberty without elegance, with contempt of style, but with the sincerity of a deep conviction. The exquisite prose of Plato could not hold its place against the bald aphorisms of Epicurus, or the clumsy arguments of the Cypriote Zeno. These men openly despised any quality in

[1] We shall speak in due time of his only noted pupil, Timon of Phlius.

style except clearness, and we may be sure that in this they appealed to the sense of their public, which was tired of idle rhetoric.

It remains for us to sketch briefly the external history of the establishment of these schools and their relation to the state and to the rulers of Athens, up to the invasion of the Celts. We can do this all the more easily, as no original school arose except at Athens. Alexandria and Pergamum only continued what had already been taught at Athens. Many great thinkers originated elsewhere, but, as I have said, they gravitated to Athens. They were honoured indeed in their homes, as, for example, Menedemus in Eretria and Pyrrho in Elis.[1] They received high compliments, such as statues; and solid ones, such as immunity from state burdens. Indeed, these honours became the ordinary reward of eminent philosophers throughout Greece. But nowhere, except in Athens, do we hear of a philosophic body with endowments, legal succession, and the other rights of a corporation.

This idea, which has never since died out of the world, was due to Plato, who bequeathed his garden and appointments in the place called after the hero Hekademus, to his followers. But he was obliged to do it in the only form possible at Athens. He made it a religious foundation, on the basis of a fixed worship to the Muses—a Μουσεῖον[2]—

[1] An inscription found near Phocis, and quoted by Wilamowitz (*Ant. Kar.* p. 291), speaks of a man as a Πυρρωνιαστάς, or follower of Pyrrho, which shows that he had an acknowledged spiritual school, though not localised or endowed.

[2] The title Μουσεῖον, however, seems older, even in this connexion. Diogenes Laertius (viii. 1, § 15) quotes Favorinus to the effect that the people of Metapontum called the house where Pythagoras dwelt Δημήτρος ἱερόν, and the lane where it stood μουσεῖον. This could hardly have been copied from Plato's Academy, and may have even suggested the title.

which was to be perpetually rendered by his school in monthly offerings, accompanied by a reunion of the members and a common feast. As Wilamowitz has shown in an interesting appendix to his *Antigonus of Karystos*, this was the form of all private clubs and associations at Athens, and was the thoroughly legal cloak under which very illegal and immoral objects were often concealed. The right of private association with fixed contributions, which the society had the same right of enforcing against defaulters that our clubs have, appears to have dated from the days of Solon. The head or President of Plato's 'Association of the Muses' was the treasurer and manager of the common fund, who invited guests to their feasts, to which each member contributed his share (ἔρανος). The members had, moreover, a right to attend lectures and use the library or scientific appointments, such as maps, which belonged to the school. It was this endowment on a religious basis which saved the income and position of Plato's school for centuries. He left the election of the president to a vote of the club, and we are told that Xenocrates was elected after the death of Speusippus by a small majority over Menedemus and Heracleides—Aristotle, who always remained a member of the Θίασος, having gone away to Macedonia.

This then is the first *Academy*, so often imitated in so many lands, and of which our colleges are the direct descendants. The religious character of the mediaeval foundations is, however, only an accidental resemblance to the religious feature in Plato's Academy. It was in no sense to spread the religion of the Muses, or of any other deity, that these associations were formed. They adopted the old type legalised at Athens for any private association; such a thing as a political club could be prosecuted as contrary

to law. It was apparently on the ground of this legality of religious Associations that the attack of Sophocles and Democharès was set aside, and the right of founding and keeping philosophical schools in the form of a religious club deliberately declared to be within the ancient law of Athens. The school of Plato, then governed by Xenocrates, being the bequest of an Athenian citizen who understood the law, seems never to have been assailed. The schools of Epicurus and Zeno were perhaps not yet recognised. But that of Theophrastus—perhaps the most crowded, certainly the most distinctly philo-Macedonian, and moreover in the hands of *metics* from the beginning—was the school which was exiled, and which owed its rehabilitation not only to the legal decision of the courts, but still more to the large views of King Demetrius, who would not tolerate the persecution of opinion.

But it was the other Demetrius, the philosopher, the pupil of Aristotle, the friend of Theophrastus, to whom the school owed most, and to whom the world owes most in the matter of museums and academies, next after Plato. For this was the man who took care, during his protectorate of Athens in the interest of Casander, to establish a garden and *peripatos* for the Peripatetic school, now under Theophrastus. He copied no doubt the model of Plato, and the will of Theophrastus, given verbatim by Diogenes,[1] shows

[1] v. §§ 51 *sq.*—'All will be well; but should anything occur, I make this will. All the furniture of my house I give to Melantes and Pancreon. But from the property contributed by Hipparchus I wish the following to be done: first, that all about the museum and the goddesses shall be completed and improved as far as possible. Then that the statue of Aristotle shall be placed in the shrine and the other offerings which were there before; then that the colonnade beside the museum shall be rebuilt not worse than before, and that the map which contains the circuit of the earth, be placed in the lower stoa,' etc. 'Our property in Stagira I leave to Callinus, all my books to Neleus. But

us clearly the religious devotion to the Muses, the reverence of the founder Aristotle, and the care to bequeath the property in trust to the representatives of the doctrine, with a clause against appropriation or alienation.

It is remarkable that the Stoic school—it too the school of aliens—did not establish a local foundation or succession, but taught in public places, such as the Painted Portico. In this the Cynical tone of the Porch comes out. Hence the succession depended upon the genius of the leader.

Epicurus, on the other hand, a full citizen, but with philosophical objections to the worship of traditional gods, seems to have left his property (his house and garden) to his natural heirs, subject to a charge for his successors; and accordingly the property of this school was dissipated after very few generations in the troubles of the times. But as Wilamowitz has well pointed out, the Hellenic habit of assembling under the sanction of some formal worship[1] clung to the Epicureans, and they raised their founder to this position, meeting for commemorative club dinners on

the garden and the pleasure-ground (*περίπατον*) and the buildings attached to the garden I give all to those of my friends hereafter enumerated who desire to keep school and study philosophy together in them. And since it is not possible for all (these) men to reside at home always, (I bequeath) on the condition that no one shall alienate this property or annex it to his private use, but that they shall possess it as a sacred property in common, and shall live together in familiarity and friendship, as is right and proper.' He then enumerates ten names, and makes provision for Aristotle's natural heirs being also admitted. 'And let them bury me in whatever spot of the garden may seem best, without extravagance either as to the funeral or the monument.' He then provides for the manumission of several slaves. There are executors named, and witnesses, and three copies of the will to be preserved separately.

[1] There were in both Aug. Comte and J. S. Mill curious echoes of the same kind of longing for some shrine, and some worship of somebody.

the twentieth of each month, and having a special yearly feast in honour of his birthday.

Thus we have philosophy and academic schools established under the countenance of the state, and favoured by kings and governors. There are many ribald stories told of the license and luxury of the regent-philosopher Demetrius, of his splendid banquets, of his yellow-dyed hair, his rouge and his unguents, of his minions and lady boon-companions. He did not indeed belong to any stricter school than that which conceded that there were good things not only of mind, but of body and estate. We recognise in this remarkable figure the fact that philosophy was no longer the pride and privilege of ascetics, and of professional directors of conscience, but that it acknowledged a wider sphere, and was prepared to take help and countenance from kings and governments.[1] No one in that day blamed Theophrastus for benefiting by the circumstances of the day, and we may thank him for the large wisdom which permitted a really great organiser to help in the permanent establishment of his school. When Casander and King Demetrius were gone, and Antigonus Gonatas, the friend of the Stoics, came to power, or at least to influence, under his father, the regent of Casander departed to Egypt, where he organised the second great and permanent Museum of the world, under the patronage of Ptolemy. This new achievement of the so-called Sybarite, together with the long catalogue of his writings given by Diogenes Laertius, shows that his mental activity must have been extraordinary, and even leads us to suspect that some of the adventures of his more brilliant namesake were transferred

[1] A generation later, it was remarkable, and a sign of the parade of independence in Chrysippus, that he had *not* dedicated any of his numerous books to any king. Cf. Diog. L. vii. 7, § 8.

to his account. The vulgar and silly crowd of Athens, when it transferred its wild flattery to King Demetrius, and disgusted him with fulsome praise, destroyed in a moment all the statues and honours set up to his philosopher opponent. But for this ebullition of popular meanness we should have had inscriptions in plenty, and probably portrait statues of the man. Nothing is now left by jealous time but the scurrilous anecdotes in Athenaeus and Diogenes, and the magnificent record of having established the Lyceum in safety at Athens, and founded the schools of Alexandria.[1]

[1] I do not take any account of his fragments, which are so few as to offer no ground for judging his eloquence; nor does the sentence quoted by Polybius (xxix. 21) with extravagant laudation show us more than that he remained in high repute as a writer for 150 years. But that is something.

CHAPTER VIII

THE GOLDEN AGE OF THE HELLENISTIC WORLD

As this book is not a formal history of Hellenism, I may allow myself the advantage of grouping the facts of social importance according to a selection not strictly chronological. The Greek world is now growing so wide, and has so many local centres, that the history of the third century B.C. is very complicated, and for our purpose it is better to adopt for each generation some fixed standpoint, and look out upon the ebbing and flowing tide as it there appears. It is natural, too, to select the standpoint for the time most prominent, and so shift our observation according as the centres of interest vary. Some allowance must also be made for the nature of our authorities. If we have only a single local source for a certain epoch of the nation's history, we cannot do better than choose this epoch for considering that department of the Hellenistic world.

It is for these reasons that, in entering upon this golden age of Hellenistic culture, and dividing it into generations, we shall leave Athens and settle ourselves at Alexandria—the greatest capital of the day, and the most sudden and successful novelty in this novel age. From it we shall consider the other great capitals of the Greek-speaking world. This will lead us in the next generation to transfer

ourselves to Pergamum, no doubt a second-hand Alexandria, but coming into so much closer and deeper sympathy with the older Hellenic spirit as to produce in art and in culture a more perfect bloom.[1] The last generation of this momentous century we shall spend at Rhodes, whose commercial policy, long respected by all, became of first-rate importance when the great kings of the Hellenistic empires died out suddenly and simultaneously, and left their wealth and power to unworthy or obscure successors. The Antioch of Antiochus Epiphanes will come next in order. Then, owing to our inestimable source—Polybius—coming into play, we shall turn back to Greece itself and to Macedonia, where ultimately the struggle of Hellenism and Romanism as independent powers was decided, the former thereafter sinking into the service of the latter.

During the whole of these five generations all the eastern world, as far as the Euphrates, was in constant ferment, and all its sovrans were related by marriage, by treaty, and by war, so that all take part in all this history. The general features of the external policy of these empires should, however, be indicated here in a few words, though they are familiar even to the English student from the brilliant sketch in Mommsen's *History of Rome*.[2]

The Hellenistic world was divided, as Europe now is, into a complex of first-class and second-class powers, each pursuing a policy mainly determined by its neighbours and their mutual relations. There were in the first place imperial

[1] This judgment may, however, yet be reversed by the excavation of old Alexandria, of which there is, alas! but little immediate prospect. The tomb of Sidon is enough to make us suspend all our judgments hitherto based upon negative evidence.

[2] Book iii. chap. viii. We now have the fourth volume of Holm's brilliant *History of Greece*, which covers this ground, and supplies a great need.

interests, each kingdom seeking to obtain as much tax-paying territory as possible, and to secure its frontiers by fortresses and by treaties against encroachment. There were in the next place commercial interests, which became of such importance as to occasion great wars, and to enlist in them nations apparently far removed from the arena of dispute. There were lastly sentimental interests, such as those of art, of ancient dignity and of culture, which, if they did not actually cause disturbances, at least exacerbated enmities in the Hellenistic world. The sovrans, too, of that day were allied as universally and as intricately as the sovrans of modern Europe, for marriage with a subject seems to have been as much forbidden then by fashion as it is now by law among us. Accordingly, if ever the *balance of power* has been a definite idea swaying a great company of correlated sovranties, it was so then, and the frequent pretext of wars for the sake of peace. Every encroachment by one great power was met by counter-encroachments, or by diplomatic protests from the rest. The second-rate powers even regarded such a balance as vital to their own liberties, and threw in their influence with the weaker side to redress any disturbance. No old alliance, no marriage connexions, no conviction of the blessings of peace and dislike of war, prevented this kind of collision, which they often essayed, as we have done, to stave off by international arbitration, but with little better success.

The main members of this Hellenistic world, related as I have described, were first the three great powers—Macedonia, Egypt, and Syria, so called from its Hellenistic aspect. Three great dynasties—the Antigonids, the Lagids, and the Seleucids—were the acknowledged and popular rulers of these empires, often connected by marriage, and always estranged by conflicting interests. Their diplomatic

relations were complicated by a number of second-rate powers, some independent, some under suzerainty, but always affording rival suzerains some ground of interference, and a stepping-stone to direct attack. These second-rate powers were, in the first place, Greece, which was claimed as a vassal country by the Macedonian kings, but always kept asserting its independence at the invitation or through the support of Egypt, whose superior fleets and subsidies were constantly making inroads on the influence of Macedonia. Next came the new kingdom of Pergamum, founded on the ruins of that of Lysimachus, and gathering his Asiatic province into a distinct and important unity. This kingdom, threatened on the seaboard by the Egyptian fleets, and from the inland by the Seleucids, was bound more than any power to keep these empires in exact balance. Then we have the league of free Greek cities, reaching from the Black Sea to Cilicia, under the presidency of Rhodes, and well compared to the Hanseatic League of mediaeval Europe. The league of the islands round Delos seems to have been a separate system devised by the first Ptolemy. The fleet and mercantile influence of Rhodes made it of first-rate importance as a defensive, though not as an invading power. Its fleet, indeed, in alliance with any sovran made him irresistible at sea.

There were, moreover, some outlying provinces which proved strength or weakness in turn. Macedon seems to have had territorial possessions in Caria, which were of great value as a post of observation against Egypt.[1] This latter dominion could indeed only be attacked by crippling its navy, or by seizing the discontented province of Cyrene, which seems, as it were, its Ireland, and which readily accepted any foreign potentate as a deliverer. Then Syria

[1] Cf. Droysen's *Hell.* iii. 2, 71 for the evidence.

was assailable through Palestine, which had a close connexion either of submission or of sympathy with Egypt ever since Alexander had favoured great Jewish settlements in Alexandria—now the greatest Jewish centre in the world. The Seleucids had also a long and precarious eastern frontier, and the deserts which lay between the eastern and western provinces of their straggling empire formed an indelible line of severance, laid down by nature, accentuated by language and religion, which nothing but the genius of an Alexander could have effaced.

It was in this mass of common and yet conflicting interests that Hellenistic culture sowed its seed, and produced that remarkable harvest in art, in literature, and in culture which has not again been equalled till the days of modern Europe. As every European, however differing in language, manners, and religion, represents, nevertheless, a distinct type of man, differing widely from the Asiatic or the African, so a Hellenist in the third century B.C. differed from a Roman or an Indian, and with this peculiar advantage over us, that since the breakdown of Latin as a common medium of intercourse we are getting separated into sections by our diverse languages, while every member of the Hellenistic world retained or adopted Greek. European civilisation will not indeed attain any real solidarity till some common language is adopted as a necessary supplement to the local mother-tongues. The most exclusive and unsympathetic of all the nations which formed the Hellenistic world was doubtless that of the Jews; and yet we find our largest and earliest of Hellenistic prose books to be the so-called *Septuagint*—the Greek translation of the Old Testament made for the Alexandrian Jews and their proselytes. The Bactrian kings might well have been thought beyond the pale, and we know that the nations about the

Indus reverted ultimately to their ancestral ways, yet the Bactrian kings have left us coins with Greek names and legends, which show that as many Iranian chiefs boasted their descent from the great Alexander, the echo of whose name still haunts the Afghan mountains, so a whole race of Hellenistic kings spread Greek art and some kind of Greek culture to the very heart of India.

Every such large and vague unity as Hellenism or Europeanism requires not only definite bonds of similarity, such as language in the former, religion in the latter, but the accentuation of lesser and indefinite likenesses by the sharp contrast of some totally different and antagonistic kind of human nature, brought up in different climate, associations, manners and creed. Thus the old Hellenic unity of opposed and conflicting states had been, if not created, at least cemented and exhibited to the world by its antagonism to oriental and despotic Persia. This contrast, however, had been effaced by Alexander, who diluted the Macedonians with Greeks, and fused both with the Persians in civil and military employment. So the boundaries of nationalities were being obliterated, and the marked characteristics of Hellenedom *by contrast* were disappearing.

It is hard to estimate what would have been the loss to Hellenism, and so to succeeding ages, had not the want been supplied by a new and terrible kind of human being, the scourge of the world, giving depth to curses and to prayer, splendour to conflict and to victory, just pride and thankfulness to the champions of civilisation. For as the northern heathen are to the legendary Round Table of Arthur, so are the Celts (Galatae) to Hellenism.[1] Coming in with an

[1] Their first appearance in Greek literature (as great boasters and tellers of wonders) is said to be in the *Geryones* of Ephippus. Cf. Bergk *Gr. Lit.-Gesch.* iv. 131.

irresistible tide of invasion from the North, strange in stature and in tongue, impious in religion and utterly inhuman in cruelty, these barbarians devastated Northern Greece far more terribly than the oriental hordes of Xerxes had once done, and they were repulsed only by the most splendid patriotism of noble men, combined with the visible interposition of the blessed gods. Then the tide flowed eastward, and finally stayed in the fertile uplands of Northern Asia Minor, there to remain a record for the truth of the great artistic outburst which celebrated the successful struggle of civilised men, though these were fain to be content with the compromise of tolerating a nest of mercenaries and free-booters in their midst, because Greeks could hire them to fight against Greeks, and, if need be, even against their fellow-savages.

Except the Egyptian king, who lay far away in safety from attack,[1] every leading sovran in the generation before us made his fortune and his fame—his undoubted claim to be a leader of civilised men—by a great victory over the Galatians, which was celebrated, we may assume, in poetry, we know, in art. It was the victory of Antigonus Gonatas over these invaders at Chalkedon on the Bosporus, the victory of Antiochus Soter with his elephants, the victory of Attalus of Pergamum, which gained for each of these princes his place in the imagination of the age, and were commemorated by titles—Soter is an example—by coins, on which the elephant appears as he does on the colours of our regiments which fought at Assaye, and by the splendid artistic remains which have recently turned so much public attention

[1] Even Ptolemy Philadelphus laid claim to this merit, at least in the mouths of his flatterers, because he had exterminated a horde of them whom he engaged to fight for him, but who showed too keen a desire for the riches of their paymaster.

to Pergamum. We know that the Apollo Belvedere and the 'Dying Gladiator' owe their splendour to the excitement of genius caused by this great national struggle, which merged all petty jealousies and quarrels in the huge terror and pity of the real tragedy—massacre, rapine, indescribable outrage of the weak and helpless, insane devastation of the fruits of the earth, barbarous destruction of what centuries of art and culture had added to human comfort and delight. And if to the century of familiarity with the rude and godless ways of these Galatians as mercenaries we may trace some of the debased and barbarous features in later Hellenism—the defacing of solemn temples, the rifling of rich tombs, the ruin of fair gardens—still these savages contributed more than they took away, by affording a standing example of brutality, of lawlessness, and of indelible ill-breeding. Since the conquering days of the Turks we have had nothing like it in Europe, and the Turks were in many respects far superior to the Galatians. Perhaps the invasion of the Huns is a fairer parallel.

It will strike the reader as very remarkable that so signal a feature of the age should not have reflected itself more generally in the literature, even as it remains to us. I might reply that this literature is fragmentary and scattered by the winds of time in a manner almost unexampled for an epoch of culture and of books. And, again, what we have from this generation—the early part of the third century B.C. —is almost all from Alexandria, whither the Celts never came as conquerors but only as mercenaries, and where literary men stood far from the storm and anguish of the great invasion.[1] But the omission is really a sign how literature had drifted away from contact with the people and with the events of

[1] Callimachus, as we shall see, does his best to make the second Ptolemy a hero in this struggle, but on very weak and absurd grounds.

the day. It was becoming the apanage of pedants and critics, and sought perfection in form or accuracy, in imitation rather than in reproduction of the freshness and vigour of real life. Art had not yet fallen into this conventional state, and hence art took up the national struggle with the northern heathen as its greatest and noblest subject. We know this not only from Pausanias's description of the records at Delphi, but from the remains of Pergamum.[1] Hence we may know that the art of that day was greater than the literature. Even when the poets of Alexandria did condescend to celebrate actual events, it was rather a royal marriage or festival or religious pomp which struck them as a worthy subject. We know that Lycophron, the notorious enigmatist of the *Alexandra,* did compose tragedies on historical subjects, and he even approached the time and place of the Celtic fury in his *Casandreans.* But it was the tyranny and cruelty of Apollodorus, their despot

[1] The only detailed account we now have of the Celtic invasion of Greece is that of Pausanias x. 19 *sq.* His narrative has so many poetical touches, and so many curious repetitions of Herodotus's stories about the Persian invasion, that though he mentions no authority, we must assume him to have used either a contemporary poem or an epical narrative written while the events were still quite fresh in men's minds. This unknown work, by an unknown author, may qualify what I have said in the text, though the total oblivion of it till the days of Pausanias really establishes my point. So the Celtic guards of Apollodorus may have been represented as the actual torturers of men in Lycophron's *Casandreans*; but we are told that his main adviser in the arts of tyranny was a certain Calliphon, who had learned them at the Sicilian courts. Hence it was clearly the Greek tyrant that Lycophron painted. Cf. details of his human sacrifice and his Celtic guards in Diod. xxii. 2. Cf. also the story in Plut. *de ser. num. vind.* x. concerning the awful dreams of Apollodorus, which were probably taken from the same play. How well recognised Hellenistic royalty must then have been is proved by this choice of tyrannous royalty and its excesses by a court poet, as a subject in no way reflecting upon the Egyptian kings, except perhaps by way of eulogy for their mansuetude in contrast to horrid cruelties.

during the crisis, which occupied him; so that though he may have introduced a Galatian bodyguard of ruffians as abetting the tyrant, it was the old and vulgar topic of Hellenic tyranny—Phalaris and Dionysius over again—and not the outlandish barbarism of the invaders, which he chose to represent. It is remarkable also that through this now forgotten but once popular tragedy the rule of Apollodorus becomes the typical and signal instance of cruel oppression, as if this wretch in his mushroom town were to be spoken of in comparison with the great criminals who left deep scars upon the history of ancient and famous Hellenic states.

CHAPTER IX

ALEXANDRIA AND ITS RIVALS

It is usual, when undertaking to speak of Alexandria, to begin with eulogies of the genius of its great founder, who is supposed to have divined with prophetic insight the one spot in the world pre-eminently suited for a great city. It is often supposed that he intended it for his capital, and yet we can hardly say that he could have had any definite views where to place the capital of an empire not then determined, but certainly intended in his dreams to include far more than the known world. It may have been his momentary view to have his provisional capital in Egypt; but as his Eastern conquests increased he must have felt that Babylon was a better centre; and had his soldiers not compelled him to stay his course we can well imagine him again changing his mind when he came in sight of fabulous splendour and vast myriads of people in the regions of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra. Moreover he founded some sixty or seventy other cities, some of which remain to this day, and yet none of them have had the marvellous success of the Egyptian Alexandria, though all were no doubt founded with the same insight. The Greeks had founded the town of Naucratis, centuries before, near the Canopic mouth of the Nile, not many miles from the site of the new city,

and yet it never attained any peculiar splendour, because there was no Alexander to create its prosperity. Had he chosen another site, the result would probably have been the same.

If, therefore, the greatness of Alexandria were indeed due to the genius of its founder, it was not because of his inspiration as to its site, but because he had the power to insist upon its importance in Egypt, of which he made it the capital, and because his rapid conquests opened up vast new fields for commerce by the extending of Greek control into the East. But the other efficient cause of Alexandria's superiority over its commercial rivals was not its site, but its good fortune in obtaining from the first a monarch of the ability, the energy, and the wisdom of Ptolemy Soter.[1] Though associated from the beginning with all the vast schemes and enterprises of Alexander, Ptolemy was the only one of the Diadochi whom we find keeping his mental balance and the measure of his power amid a society of men maddened with ambition and distraught with the dream of succeeding to the empire of the world. He was the only one who saw from the beginning that Egypt was an easily separable and thoroughly defensible province, of such size and resources as to make it in able hands an important kingdom.

Thus while all his rivals, first Perdikkas, then Antigonus, then Demetrius, and lastly Seleucus, spent their talents and lost their lives in striving to rule the world, he determined to make Egypt his secure dominion, and then extend his power as far as circumstances might permit, but rather by

[1] On the occasion of his being called by this name, and the difficulties connected with it, I must refer the reader to the discussion in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* pp. 62, 63, 110 *sq.* The title was given to many other kings and apparently to Antigonus and Demetrius, by the Athenians, before Ptolemy adopted it.

policy and influence than by regular campaigns and systematic conquest. Cyprus and Cyrene he acquired in this way, but ruled them not as a part of his personal kingdom. He placed in them princes of his family as satraps or governors. Palestine and Syria he was really anxious to conquer, and made several attempts to do so—political as well as military. But Egypt seemed as difficult to extend as it was easy to defend. Twice in his life, at the first moment of his establishment (B.C. 322), and again at the zenith of Antigonus's power (B.C. 306), he was obliged to resist great invasions. But the failure and death of Perdikkas, his first assailant, and the complete defeat of Antigonus, showed that Ptolemy was practically inexpugnable. For in addition to the natural defences of his country, which were of the strongest kind, he had permanently conciliated by his policy not only the Jews, his next neighbours on land, who always assisted him and thwarted his enemies in the direction of Syria, but also the Rhodians, whose maritime influence could neutralise any attack upon him by sea. Instead of trying to conquer this mercantile state, which he might easily have done by destroying its commerce, he had the large wisdom to support and befriend it, and so to obtain an influence in Greek waters which made him master of the Aegean. For we now know from the evidence of texts at Delos that this was the prince who saw the importance of protecting and strengthening the *κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν* of which he and his successors became the formal presidents, and which had its yearly feast, the Ptolemaea, at Delos or Tenos till the days of Ptolemy Philopator.[1]

Such was the external policy of this remarkable man, who, while his rivals were wasting themselves in internecine struggles, was consolidating his empire and developing the

[1] Cf. *BCH* iv. 321-323, 332.

commercial resources of his admirable position. The advantage he gained by maintaining peace and promoting industry during a whole generation spent by the Hellenistic world in profligate and ruinous wars, gave Alexandria a start which the other new capitals were never able to recover. Antioch came nearest, and ultimately asserted its place as a great capital of like importance in the East; Lysimacheia, had the genius of Lysimachus been equal to that of Ptolemy, and had his time been as long, might also have become a great trading city. But the empire of Lysimachus, for a while so powerful, passed away, and its place was taken by Pergamum, which had neither the command of a great thoroughfare nor the support of a great territory. Macedonia had neither the position nor the genius for commerce. So Alexandria, under the sway of its satrap king, with his reasonable and consistent policy, rapidly became the first of Hellenistic capitals.

It had been, as it were, created for a commercial site, communicating with the sea by its two harbours facing NE. and SW. Through Lake Mareotis, to the south, to which it was joined by a canal, it communicated with the mouths of the Nile, and so with the upper country. Its climate was then, as it is now, considered temperate, a constant northerly sea-breeze moderating the fierce heat of the Egyptian summer.[1] Strabo further remarks that in any other (southern) climate towns built on the shores of lakes were unhealthy, as the lower summer level leaves swampy surfaces uncovered, which breed fever. In Alexandria, on

[1] Cf. Strabo xvii. 7. The prevalence of NW. winds during most of the year makes it possible to run in, and to beat out, not without difficulty, from both harbours with any good sailing vessel. But for our large ships it is not a safe coast, nor is the remaining harbour a safe one. Legend asserted that the SW. harbour was named Eunostos after a companion of Alexander.

the other hand, there was no such danger, because the rising of the Nile in summer kept the lake at a high level. This remark applies to all Egypt, and is perhaps the chief cause of its eternal importance and wealth. Waterways are even now, in the days of railroads, far cheaper and more serviceable for heavy traffic than any land transport. They were eminently so in the days when sailing ships had only caravans to contend with; all the wealth of the Mediterranean and Euxine coasts could be deposited at Alexandria directly by shipping; so could the precious luxuries of Nubia and inner Africa, by descending the Nile; the riches of Arabia and of India were brought up the Red Sea, on whose shores several towns were established to secure them from Arabian pirates; while the old canal of Pharaoh-Necho was presently re-opened into the Nile, so that Indian ships could bring, without once unlading, their gold and ivory, their apes and peacocks, to Alexandria.

These natural advantages, great as they were, would have lain comparatively idle in the hands of either the actual conquerors or the conquered, for the Macedonians showed no genius for trade, and the Egyptians had long occupied the very spot without discovering its immense capabilities. Though the agricultural and industrial resources of Egypt were enormous, foreign trading was never congenial to them. But Ptolemy, and indeed Alexander at the foundation of the city, made good this deficiency by importing great settlements of the two nations which, above all others, have shown trading instincts through their long history—the Greeks and the Jews.[1] Whether it was their ingrained instinct or the training of centuries—for each of them was

[1] I have endeavoured to show in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 10 that the proximity of Naucratis both determined the site, and also largely increased the Greek population, of Alexandria.

placed on one of the great thoroughfares of ancient commerce, that of Asia Minor with the West and that of Egypt with Mesopotamia—these nations were certain then, as now, to turn every possibility of commerce to their own advantage; and we know that they soon outnumbered both the dominant Macedonians and subject Egyptians in the vast conglomerate of nationalities which made up that peculiar people, the Alexandrians. We also know from ample authority that these latter were marked by features distinguishing them from the population of the rest of Egypt, where Greeks and natives lived beside one another, but distinct in language and even to some extent in law.

But if as a commercial site Alexandria was unrivalled, we cannot say much for its natural beauty. Sandhills without wooding, without cliffs, and a tideless sea, with no far mountains or islands in sight—what could be more dreary to those who had been accustomed to the enchanting views from the Greek and Asiatic coast towns? We know that the Greeks of classical days said little about the picturesque. Nevertheless its unconscious effect upon their poetry and other forms of art is clearly discernible, and perhaps not a little of the unpicturesqueness of Alexandrian culture is due to the absence of this vague yet powerful influence. The grandeur of solemn mountains, the mystery of deep forests, the sweet homeliness of babbling streams, the scent of deep meadows and fragrant shrubs, all this was familiar even to the city people of Hellenic days. For their towns were small, and all of them surrounded by scenes of natural beauty. But the din and the dust of the new capital, reaching over an extent as great as modern Paris, were only relieved within by a few town-parks or gymnasia, and without by fashionable bathing suburbs, with the luxuries of city life replacing the sweets of nature; and if there was retire-

ment and leisure within the university, it was eminently the retirement among books—the natural home for pedants and grammarians. How much this city life weighed upon the spirits of men is proved not only by the general dryness and want of nature in the literature it produced, but still more by the great popularity of the one poet of pastoral life, who delighted the jaded senses of his literary friends by a return into the simplest, if not the purest, country life; and who rejoiced the pedants by putting them into pastoral dress, to feed their imaginary flocks on breezy uplands, to lie idle in the rich grass, to sit by the fountain 'and sport with Amaryllis in the shade.' It has been generally recognised that the success of the late after-growth of genuine Greek poetry was due to this strong and declared contrast, but the dulling effect of the actual surroundings at Alexandria has not been equally appreciated.

So much has recently been discovered about the condition of Egypt in the days immediately preceding the conquest of Alexander, and it is so interesting to watch the gradual opening up of that ancient kingdom to Greek culture, that we may be allowed to digress briefly on so important and so little known a chapter of ancient history.

As is well known from Herodotus,[1] whose authority waxes as we approach the days of Greek traditions in the country, Psammetichus I. was the king who established himself on the throne with the aid of Greek mercenaries, and who kept them about him and in special camps, the 'War Camps' on opposite banks, near one of the mouths (Pelusiac) of the Nile.[2] Herodotus tells us that any trust-

[1] See the very interesting chapters about this matter in the second book of Herodotus, viz. 152-154 and 178-180.

[2] The discoveries of Mr. Petrie at Defenneh (Tahpahnes in the Bible, Daphnae in Greek), published in his vol. ii. on Tanis, chapter vii.,

worthy knowledge whatever of Egypt among his countrymen dated from the accession of this king Psammetichus.

The mercenaries, however, gained admission to the interior, as we know from the very archaic inscriptions they have left us at Abu Simbel, and even at Wadi Halfa.[1] The former inscription, which possibly dates from about 650 B.C., and not later in any case than 590 B.C., is indisputable evidence. The practice of keeping foreign guards lasted on, and was confirmed by the succeeding kings of Egypt, to the growing disgust of the native military caste. It was soon seen that if the Greeks were allowed to usurp this service, the dignity and importance of the Egyptian troops were gone. So, Herodotus tells us, 240,000 of them made up their minds at once to emigrate to Aethiopia, in spite of King Psammetichus's entreaties, and to carry their strength and culture to a rival state. He seems, however, to have managed some accommodation with the rest, for during both his own long reign and that of Psammis (Psammetichus II.), who even visited Nubia, we hear of no disturbance. Possibly foreign wars occupied public attention. But the quarrel was not healed, and only required circumstances to renew it. Twenty-five years after Pharaoh-Hophra (Apries) came to the throne, he sent his Egyptian forces on a very arduous and unsuccessful expedition to Cyrene, whereupon they revolted, being persuaded that he had despatched them, with-

have corroborated Herodotus completely. The foundation-deposits of gold and precious stones all bore the cartouche of Psamtik, and the pottery, which was archaic Greek, corresponds to the actual century (660-560 B.C.) during which these camps were occupied.

[1] I found there in 1893, on the temple of Tothmes, not only later inscriptions, but some remains of very archaic names, written at least as early as the Abu Simbel texts. The majority of critics now attribute these latter to the soldiers under Psammetichus II. and therefore 600-590 B.C.

out proper commissariat, to perish in the desert. He sent his own brother-in-law, a high officer at court, to bring them back to allegiance, but no sooner had the latter reached the camp than he was proclaimed king by the insurgent army, which he led against his sovran. This pretender, the famous Amasis, thus made himself the champion of the national troops against the Greek mercenaries, and in the great battle that ensued he conquered and defeated Apries, who was so confident of victory that he took no precautions for retreat, and falling into the hands of his rival was presently put to death.

Here, then, was a victory which promised the restoration of the old state of things, and the prompt expulsion of the foreign troops from Egypt. What must have been the disgust of the national party when they found that, far from carrying out their policy, Amasis turned phil-Hellene, and surrounded himself, like his predecessors, with foreign guards! He evidently, though of high birth and related to the royal family, felt that he was not secure of the affection of his people. He was, moreover, such a Radical in social matters as had never yet sat on the Egyptian throne. Far from submitting to the elaborate and distressing etiquette which the priests described to Diodorus as the habit of the old Egyptian court, in which the king, under pretence of governing, was really the slave of ceremonial traditions and the figure-head of a vast sacerdotal machine, Amasis was so secular a person as to produce the impression that he was a mere upstart of low birth and vulgar habits, who delighted in violating all the decencies of life.[1] The racy anecdotes of Herodotus on this point are now curiously supplemented by a demotic papyrus,

[1] On the 'Bohemian' life of Egyptian artists cf. Revillout's curious article in *Rev. égypt.* iii. 98.

which describes the king's fondness for the wine of the country.

It was in the days of King Amasis. The king said to his high officers, I wish to drink some Kelebi-wine of Egypt [apparently a strong harsh wine made in the Fayyum]. They said to him, Great master, it is a hard thing to drink the Kelebi of Egypt. He said to them, Don't reply to what I say. They answered, Great master, the desire of the king, be it accomplished. The king said, Let the wine be brought on the lake (Mareotis). They did according to his command. The king purified himself with his sons. There was no wine before them but Kelebi of Egypt. It appeared very good to the king and his sons. He drank, while on the water, a great deal of this wine, because of the love he had for Kelebi of Egypt. The king slept that night on the lake. He ordered his course towards a vineyard which was on its shore. Morning arrived. The king could not rise, on account of his extreme state of drunkenness. The voyage proceeded. When it was found that the king could not rise, the officers bewailed themselves, and said, Is such a thing conceivable? It happened that the king turned out everybody, and nobody was allowed to go and speak to him. The officers went to him in a body and said, Our great master, the king's barge has reached its destination. The king said, I want to amuse myself.

And so they sought him a young sailor, to tell him a tale, which is unfortunately torn away.[1]

But his innovations were far more than social. Not content with having confirmed the foreigners in their position, and thus sanctioned the degradation of the military caste, he brought up his Greek soldiers from the 'War Camps' at the Pelusiac mouth of the Nile, and established them in three great fortified garrisons, at Memphis, Heliopolis and Bubastis, endowing them, moreover, with the richest 'Church lands' belonging to these cities. He

[1] Cf. Revillout *Rev. égypt.* i. 66, for whose version I am not responsible.

permitted a Greek mart—Naucratis—to be established for Greek traders, though even then their trading relations were strictly confined to Naucratis,[1] any foreigner landing elsewhere, except from proved stress of weather, being liable to be put to death. Herodotus further mentions the various Graeco-Asiatic cities which contributed to the common temple—the Hellenion—in which the traders worshipped at Naucratis. The Carian and Ionian mercenaries, says Herodotus, Amasis established as his guards against the Egyptians.

This was not all. There was in Egypt a supreme court of justice, consisting of thirty members elected from the sacred colleges of Thebes, Memphis, and Heliopolis, to whose decision all disputes with the crown seem to have been legally subject; in fact, the divine character of the monarch was in some strange way, by precedent or oath, understood or framed as a constitutional monarchy. To this supreme court appealed, as a matter of course, the injured priests; but Amasis introduced (we are told by them) the scandalous illegality of refusing to appear before them, and deciding the case before his own privy council. We find this assertion of royal prerogative a distinct feature under the Ptolemaic rule, when a *πρόσταγμα* of the king overrode the ancient law and practice of the country. Thus the priests under Amasis were obliged to give up a large part of their property, and confine their remonstrance to keeping an accurate account of what the king took from

[1] As the Chinese used to permit English traders at Shanghai only, in the stricter days of the Celestial Empire. The site of Naucratis has since been discovered, and its remains fully described by Mr. Petrie in two vols. published by the Egypt Exploration Society (1886-7). He discovered that the second Ptolemy had done large works of restoration on the old Hellenion. The indications supplied by the pottery, scarabs, etc., agree very well with the narrative of Herodotus.

them, as well as a record of his audacious levities and irregularities.[1]

In spite of all these violations of royal propriety, Amasis maintained himself on the throne for over forty years, and died in peace and prosperity before Cambyses arrived to attack him. The furious Persian was only able to violate his tomb, and insult the memories of the king and queen, as we know not only from Herodotus but from the present condition of their sarcophagi. The discontented Egyptians, who hoped to get rid of the mercenaries, and also of the radical policy of the king, found themselves 'chastised with scorpions,' and their religion insulted in a very different spirit by the Persian conqueror. We may be sure that he did not reinstate the priests in their Church lands, and we know that he did not expel the intruding Greeks from Egypt. On the contrary, in the revolts and wars which follow, we find them on both sides taking the leading part in the fighting, often no doubt betraying their employers, but always profiting at the cost of the old population. So generally recognised was this predominance of Greek mercenaries that the native military caste silently disappears from Egyptian history, and under the Ptolemies we hear but once or twice of this once famous order.[2]

Curious demotic documents are now being deciphered containing the complaints of the old Egyptian party concerning these things. Amasis had been, though not the

[1] From the extant document regarding the latter I have already quoted; a copy of the former has been deciphered by the skill of M. Revillout, and is printed in his *Rev. égypt.* i. 59, 60. It is clear from the story of Joseph (Gen. xlvii. 22) that in older days the priests had a daily allowance from Pharaoh, quite distinct from their lands. This is asserted as the reason why their lands never became royal property like the rest of Egypt.

[2] On the Rosetta stone the μάχιμοι, who had taken a part in a recent revolution, are informed that they may return to their homes.

author, the main promoter of this denationalisation of the army; he had gone so far as to give the foreigners landed property; he had even done worse, for he had said, 'Let them bring their gods.' Now every ruler depends on them for support. 'They are people that accumulate vain promises, their heart is of brass, they have established their gods without obeying the voice of justice. Their belly stands to them in place of a heart. Their gods have prompted them to waste with fire Upper and Lower Egypt. Death is in their train. They will never be driven out.'[1]

Darius seems to have organised Egypt not on the old national basis, but as a satrapy ruled by a Persian noble, and, above all, he seems to have based his taxation on the model of Amasis. If anything was taken from the Greeks, it was not given back to the Egyptian priests, but turned into royal domain. And so during the various revolts of the natives down to the bloody reconquest by Ochus (about 350 B.C.) we have constantly patriotic chiefs, or relatives of the old royal family, appealing to the old national sentiment, and carrying on long and chequered contests with their Persian oppressors.[2] Both Athenians and Spartans sent armies to assist the Egyptian against the Persian, and so even the national party was obliged to use the old two-edged weapon, and depend on strangers, who, if successful, were certain to demand a share of the country.

But in spite of many reverses, the priests, or established Church of the country, though impoverished, were strong and united enough to keep up the national feeling and much of the old social life of Egypt. They were a great corporation, with which all the Ptolemies were specially concerned,

[1] *Rev. Égypt.* i. 82, note.

[2] See the reference to one of these insurgent nationalists against Xerxes, viz. Chabbas, in the curious document printed below, pp. 190 *sqq.*

and which represented all the national interests of the aborigines against those of the foreign population. In the upper and more secluded parts of Egypt we know that manners and customs were but little changed. The contracts of marriage or business which come from Thebes show quite a different tone from those of Memphis, now the more fashionable capital, which had been influenced by trade and foreign residents.[1] The days came when even this city became old-fashioned and deserted in comparison with Alexandria, the third and last capital of that strange country in olden times.

I will only mention briefly here a few of the most notable social features disclosed by the demotic papyri, and deciphered within the last three or four years. On the economic conditions of the country they are very full indeed and direct. But they also throw some light on the general character of Egyptian society.

By a curious chance the family papers of two houses of respectability, one at Thebes and one at Memphis, have been recovered among the demotic papyri now in the museums of Europe. We have the wills, marriage settlements, mortgages, and other transfers of landed and house property carried on for generations by these two families; we can tell which of them was saving and increased his means; which of them was a spendthrift; above all, we find in these documents precious corroboration of those peculiarities which struck all foreign observers, from Herodotus onwards, as so salient in Egyptian life. M. Revillout has spent years of ingenuity and labour in discovering and fitting

[1] There must have been a day when the reverse was the case. For Memphis, the capital of the ancient empire of Menes, was displaced by the splendours of the Theban dynasties of the Ramessids. But this happened some 1500 years earlier. Diodorus (i. 50) mentions the change noted above.

together chronologically these papers, which are in London, Dublin, Paris, Turin, and elsewhere; and it is to him, as I willingly repeat, that our new knowledge on these subjects is almost wholly due.

The first and largest peculiarity in these legal documents is one which certainly dates from old times, inasmuch as it is opposed to the sentiment alike of Greeks, Persians, and Jews. This was the legal independence and freedom of women. Even a married woman makes contracts in her own name, holds property, and does all legal acts without reference to her husband. In fact, a married pair may each contract separately, and they often do so. Monogamy is distinctly the rule, though not enforced by criminal law, for a constant condition in marriage settlements is this: 'If I (the husband) shall turn aside to any other woman, or shall declare any other woman my wife, then I shall surrender' this or that, or repay dowry, or submit to various pecuniary penalties. Nay, further, so supreme is the position of women that we even have a man settling all his property, present and *prospective*, on his wife, with this only condition on her part, that she will support him while he lives, and give him a decent funeral and sepulture when he dies! Could anything be a more curious illustration of the passages in Sophocles and Herodotus,[1] where the Greeks jeer at the customs of Egypt, inasmuch as the men followed female employments, and even what others thought female habits, while the women performed the graver duties of the other sex. To the Greeks such manners would appear absurd. As soon as they settled in the country, especially after the conquest by Alexander, they felt that they must

[1] Soph. *OC* vv. 337 *sq.*; Herod. ii. 35. The former passage is probably borrowed either from Herodotus's work or from his conversation. Cf. my *History of Greek Literature* ii. 19.

have separate laws and separate magistrates, for to them a woman was no legal person, but an infant represented by her κύριος or lord—be he father, brother, husband, or, in default of these, her son or next of kin. Indeed, the time came, but not till Ptolemy Philopator, when a rescript (πρόσταγμα) of the king insisted upon the consent of the husband to all the legal acts of the wife.[1] So then, especially in the remoter country parts, and in decayed cities like Thebes, when the life of fashion had moved down, with the politics, seaward, the old Egyptian life went on, and the Theban ladies could boast that they possessed a very different social status and a very different liberty from the ladies of their conquerors.

There are many other points on which we feel that Egyptian life was a thing apart, which was not easy to reconcile with Hellenic manners. The Egyptians were not, indeed, without humour and frolic, and the jocose Amasis had many counterparts in all ages there, as we know from the scenes of revelry depicted on the monuments, where even grand ladies appear disgracefully drunk. We even know that the tax on ζῦθος, an intoxicating liquor made from grain, and corresponding to our beer, was one of the revenues of the government sufficiently important to be farmed out to contractors. And yet there is a deliberation, a solemnity about their art and their business, a circumstance about all their life, which mark them as a peculiar people. The rule of a priestly caste was distinctly one cause of this, and also a consequence of their solemn temper, which would not else have tolerated the endless ceremonies, the complicated titles on documents, the sixteen witnesses to every legal act, the cumbrous and expensive ritual with

[1] Diodorus i. 27 states the practice quite accurately, but was hardly believed by critics till the recent confirmations mentioned in the text.

which these priests fixed and kept their influence over the people. The Ptolemies found no better way of securing the allegiance of the people to new arrangements, to new claims of divinity, to new procedure in law, than to assemble the priests in solemn conclave,—or, rather, to persuade or bribe them at their annual solemn visit to court, so that, assembling presently at a synod or oecumenical council, they might proclaim the will of the king as the voice of the ruling caste. Two such public declarations are preserved to us in the famous inscription of Tanis, and the still more famous and better known inscription of Rosetta. To these we shall return in due time.

It was either by a stroke of genius, or a rare piece of fortune, that the new Hellenistic capital was founded far away from the great centres of sacerdotal, and therefore of strictly Egyptian life. It tended to withdraw from Memphis, Thebes, and other ancient and sacred sites, the foreign population which was always distasteful to the natives; and at Alexandria the Greeks had only found the obscure and unimportant village of Rakotis, whose poor and ignoble population could easily be reconciled in some way with the new settlers, yet even so only by allowing them a separate quarter.

Nothing will give the reader so clear a perception of the inner contrasts between Greek and Egyptian life as to lay before him the actual text of the earliest declaration of policy made in hieroglyphics by Ptolemy Soter.[1] Here it is:—

[1] H. Brugsch gave it with a German translation at the opening of the vol. for 1871 of Lepsius's *Zeitschrift für Aegyptologie*. Most readers will excuse the prolixity of the document for the sake of seeing a specimen of Egyptian style, and its strong contrasts in literary style to anything Greek; but it may be skipped by those who dislike the wordiness of official language.

'In the year 7 [*i.e.* 312-311 B.C. of the boy king Alexander IV., whose formal reign began with the death of Philip Arridaeus], at the beginning of the inundation, under the sanctity of Horus, the youthful, rich in strength, the lord of diadems, loving the gods who gave him the dignity of his father, the Horus of gold, lord in the whole world, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, the lord of both lands, the delight of the heart of Amon, chosen by the sun, son of the Sun, of Alexander the ever-living, the friend of the gods of the cities *Pe* and *Tep*. He being as king in the world of strangers, his Holiness was in the interior of Asia, so that there was a great viceroy in Egypt, Ptolemy was his name. A person of youthful vigour was he, strong in his two arms, a king in spirit, mighty among the people, of stout courage, of firm foot, resisting the furious, not turning his back, striking his adversaries in the face in the midst of the battle. When he had seized the bow, it was not [for] one shot at the assailant, it was a [mere] play with his sword; in the midst of the battle not a question of staying beside him, of mighty hand, there is no parrying his hand, no return of that which goeth out of his mouth, there is not his like in the world of foreigners. He had brought back the images of the gods found in Asia; all the furniture of the books of all the temples of north and south Egypt, he had restored them to their place. He had made his Residence the fortress of the king loving Amon's name the chosen of the sun, the son of the Sun, Alexandria it is called on the shore of the great sea of the Ionians, Rakotis was its former name. He had assembled Ionians many, and their cavalry and their ships many with their crews, when he went with his people to the land of the Syrians, who were at war with him. He penetrated into their land, his courage was mighty as that of the hawk among little birds. He taking

them at once carried their princes, their cavalry, their ships, their works of art all to Egypt. After this, when he had set out for the territory of Marmarica (Cyrene), he laying hold of them at one time, led captive their men, women, horses, in requital for what they had done to Egypt. When he returned to Egypt, his heart being glad at what he had done, he celebrated a good day, and this great viceroy was seeking the best [thing to do] for the gods of Upper and Lower Egypt. There spoke to him he that was at his side, and the elders of the land of Lower Egypt, that the sea-land, the land of Buto is its name, had been granted by the king, the image of Tanen, chosen by Ptah, the son of the Sun, Chabbas living for ever, to the gods of *Pe* and *Tep*, after his Holiness [Chabbas] was gone to *Pe Tep* to examine all the sea-land in their territory, to go into the interior of the marshes, to examine every arm of the Nile which goes into the great sea, to keep off the fleet of Asia from Egypt.

'Then spoke his Holiness [Ptolemy] to him who was at his side: This sea-land let me get to know it. They spoke before his Holiness: This sea-land, it is called the land of Buto, is the property of the gods of *Pe Tep* from earlier time. The enemy Xerxes reversed it, nor had he given anything of his to the gods of *Pe Tep*. His Holiness spake that there should be brought before him the priests and magistrates of *Pe Tep*. They brought them to him in haste. There spoke his Holiness: Let me learn to know the souls of the gods of *Pe Tep*, as to what they did to the miscreant on account of the wicked action which he had done, what? They answered: The miscreant Xerxes had done evil to *Pe Tep*, he had taken away its property. They spake before his Holiness: The king our Lord Horus, son of Isis, son of Osiris, the ruler of rulers, the king of the

kings of Upper Egypt, the king of the kings of Lower Egypt, the avenger of his father, the lord of Pe, being the beginning of the gods hereafter, not a king after him, cast out the miscreant Xerxes with his eldest son, making himself known in the town of Neith, Sais, on this day beside the holy mother. There spoke his Holiness: This powerful god among the gods there is not a king after him, that it may be given [me to know him] in the way of his Holiness. I swear by it. Then spake the priests and the magistrates of *Pe Tep*, that your Holiness may command, that there may be granted the sea-land, the land of Buto it is called, to the gods of *Pe Tep*, with bread, drink, oxen, birds, all good things, that there may be repeated his renewal in your name on account of his loan to the gods of *Pe Tep* as requital for the excellence of your actions. This great viceroy spake: Let a decree be drawn up in writing at the seal of the writing of the king's scribe of finance, thus: I Ptolemy, the Satrap, the land of Buto I give it to Horus, the avenger of his father, the lord of Pe, and to Buto, the lady of *Pe Tep*, from this day forth for ever, with all its villages, all its towns, all its inhabitants, all its fields, all its waters, all its oxen, all its birds, all its herds, and all things produced in it aforetime, together with what is added since, together with the gift, made by the king, the lord of both lands, Chabbas, the ever-living. Its south [limit] the territory of the town Buto, and Hermopolis of the north towards the mouths of the Nile. Its north: the downs on the shore of the great sea. Its west: the mouths of the plier of the oar—towards the downs. In the east the home of Sebennys, so that its calves may be [a supply] for the great hawks, its bulls for the countenance of Nebtanit, its oxen for the living hawks, its milk for the august child, its fowl for him in Sa, to whom is life—all things produced on its soil on the table of Horus

himself, the lord of Pe and Buto the head of Ra-Harmachis for ever. This land in extension had been given by the king, the lord of both lands, the image of Taven, chosen by Ptah, the son of the Sun, Chabbas living for ever, renewed these gifts has this great viceroy of Egypt, Ptolemy, to the gods of *Pe Tep* for ever. As reward for this that he has done, may there be given him victory and strength to his heart's content, so that fear of him may continue even as it is among strange nations. Whosoever shall propose the land of Buto, so that he shall touch it to take ought from it, may he be under the ban of those that are in Pe, under the curse of those that are in Tep, so that he may be in the fiery breath of goddess Aptari in the day of her terrors, not his son, not his daughter, may they give him water.'

This curious document, the earliest we have from the Ptolemaic times, shows us clearly the character of Soter's policy. He as yet had assumed no royal style (311 B.C.), but was nominally regent or satrap—the latter word is transcribed into hieroglyphics—for the young Alexander, but he holds absolute sway;[1] he brings back from Babylon, probably as a means of ingratiating himself with his new subjects, the spoils taken by Cambyses and Ochus from the temples.[2] He carries on successful wars in Syria, and also in the direction of Cyrene (Marmarica), and makes himself acquainted with all the districts of his country. Whether the pretender, Chabbas, whose name occurs on other inscriptions, indeed endowed the priests of these two towns in this manner, we cannot prove from independent evidence.

[1] An inscription (hieroglyphic) at the sanctuary of the large temple at Luxor tells us that it was rebuilt by the young Alexander, son of the great, which, of course, means that it was rebuilt by this Ptolemy during the boy's nominal reign.

[2] This seems a regular commonplace with the Ptolemies. Cf. the stele of Pithom for Ptolemy II., the Adule inscription for Ptolemy III.

But it was certainly the policy of all these native rebels against the Persian conquest to make an alliance with the priests of the national religion, and induce them by the bribe of large privileges to preach a crusade against the foreigners. Ptolemy Soter evidently made himself popular by the same means, though we know that he kept careful watch over his finances, and did not permit the priests to regain their former disproportionate importance in the country. Nor was the country as yet Hellenised enough to demand that a Greek version of his decree should be appended, as in later inscriptions of the kind.[1] Indeed the Greeks must have been at first singularly puzzled to translate such a document, in which we see the old formalism of the Egyptians, and their luxury of titles displayed as it has never been displayed since, except perhaps in the proclamations of the Spanish kings. But while these latter asserted titular authority over various countries, which might or might not have belonged to them, the titles of the kings of Egypt were mainly religious, identifying them with the ever-living gods. We must remember this when we see how easily the apotheosis of the new dynasty was accepted in Egypt. Probably the neglect or dislike of apotheosis would have astonished the people more, and seemed indeed a vulgar innovation. The title of king here, as in the East, seemed to imply divinity.

But while the Egyptian people were quite accustomed to accept strangers as kings, and to identify them with the old indigenous royalty by all manner of artificial devices, it seems as if Egyptian life and art had been too long fixed in stereotype to admit of any real fusion with another and a

[1] This conclusion is, however, uncertain. For we have mere hieroglyphic copies of other texts which were published in the three languages, so that we may yet find the Greek version of the present decree.

different race. What may have been the case in Alexandria is not yet to be judged from any material remains, for old Alexandria is still under the sands, and awaits her Mariette or her Schliemann. It is, however, pretty certain that here Egyptian influences were weak; the Egyptian population was only of the lower classes, and therefore the city was (till the seventh Ptolemy) Hellenistic in the sense that Antioch, Apamea, or Nicaea were.[1] We may hope soon to learn something on this point concerning Ptolemais (now Menshieh) in Upper Egypt, a city founded by the first Ptolemy, not far from Thebes, and certainly more foreign than any inland town on the Nile. But as regards all the rest, we see from the great collection in the museum of Boulaq that the early Ptolemies were unable to produce any fusion of races. There is, indeed, one statue in that museum which is really Graeco-Egyptian—a Greek ideal face with Egyptian pose and dress. It is supposed by M. Maspero to represent Alexander IV., the hapless son of the great Alexander. But, at all events, it dates from the early days of the Lagidae.[2] Later on we have plenty of works done by the orders of these kings; we have their portraits in relief upon the walls of the temples they raised to Egyptian gods and with Egyptian ritual; and with the

[1] We now have a few specimens (at Athens) of Alexandrian art representing Egyptian types realistically. Cf. Schreiber's article in *Mitth.* x. 386. There is also a head of Philometor quite Greek with an Egyptian head-dress at Athens, *op. cit.* xii. 212.

[2] M. Maspero, in giving us a picture of this statue (*Archéologie égyptienne* p. 229), notices two or three more, but of later date, and perhaps even of Roman time. He believes that in the end Greek art asserted its supremacy upon Alexandrian native artists, and that further excavations will yet prove it. But how slow and hesitating was this growth! The Greek remains of the earlier period now discovered at Naucratis and Defenneh (*Tanis* vol. ii.) are not mixed in style, though there are Egyptian men and things copied on Greek pottery.

exception of one or two rare figures in so-called Greek dress, every figure, every sculpture, every temple, is purely and completely Egyptian.

Whatever doubt may arise as to details, owing to our scanty and fragmentary information, the main features are clear enough. The constitution established by the Ptolemies was a military despotism,[1] tempered, in the hands of able and humane princes, by good administration and the permission of local customs, but, in the hands of fools or villains, degenerating at once into the vulgarest tyranny. Great care was taken to humour the susceptibilities of the various nationalities gathered into the country by its new rulers; each of them, Jews, Egyptians, and Greeks, were more or less under their own magistrates, and judged by their own codes of law. But all these lesser magistrates were in the hierarchy of office subordinate to heads of departments, these again to general administrators, and all absolutely to the king.[2] Through the country there were a few Greek towns settled, governed by Greek law, while the surrounding Egyptians were allowed to abide by their old customs, but also to appeal to the Greek magistrates and be judged by them on Greek principles. But many of the Greeks seem even to have been settled among the Egyptians without local separation, and in the Egyptian towns. We only know of Ptolemais, near Thebes, and of Naucratis, as distinctively Greek cities.[3]

[1] The clearest proof of the military character is the fact that the civil duties of the country were in the hands of the so-called *στρατηγοί*.

[2] Those desirous of studying the details of this administration will find the facts and the references (chiefly to Greek inscriptions found in Egypt) in Droysen's *Hellenismus* iii. 1, 40, or in the Introduction to vol. iii. of the *CIG*.

[3] I am now quite persuaded that neither Alexandria nor Crocodilopolis in the Fayyum were organised with a *βουλή* and *ἐκκλησία* like ordinary Greek cities. I should also notice that *Greeks* meant

It was evidently the intention or the hope of this policy to Hellenise gradually the obstinately conservative country-people in Egypt. We do not hear of separate Macedonian settlements, or of any body of Macedonians except soldiers or veterans, and must assume those of Alexandria to have been a small hereditary military aristocracy, rather distinguished by high commands than purity of blood, and forming the personal staff and household brigade of the kings. They were a very close prototype of the Praetorian Guard at Rome under the Emperors. In Alexandria they were allowed their ancient right of assembling as a body of free soldiers, and passing decrees of life or death; they formally at least proclaimed their recognition of a new king,[1] but the king had no idea of allowing them to usurp his powers—in other words, it was a copy of the state of things in Alexander's army.

In Alexandria itself the various races were for a generation at least very distinct—the Macedonians and all other royal officials living in the quarter called the Bruchium, the Egyptians in the old part of the town, Rakotis, which adjoined the peninsula on which most of modern Alexandria is built. We do not know that Jews or Greeks were positively excluded from these quarters, but no doubt the great majority resided in the remaining districts, three in number, whose names are lost, but which lay about the great thoroughfares crossing at right angles, and about the south side facing Lake Mareotis. The favours extended by Alexander and the first Ptolemy to the Jews[2] induced a great number to settle there, perhaps so many as to form one-fifth of the population. We now know that they settled

Hellenised people in the widest sense, including Macedonians, Thracians, and even Persians.

[1] Polybius xv. 32.

[2] Whether these favours amounted to full citizenship is a doubtful point, to be discussed in a later chapter, pp. 504 *sqq.*

in the Fayyum also, and in Upper Egypt, as Josephus tells us. The names of Jews and Samaritans have been found in both Fayyum documents of the third, and Theban of the second century B.C. They intended, too, from the first to make their stay permanent; they learned Greek and adapted themselves to Hellenistic culture. For the translation of their Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa into Greek began soon after their settlement, or, as we may infer from a distinct allusion to the Song of Solomon, as early as Theocritus.[1] Not content with the tame prose version of the LXX., perhaps even independently of it, or as an experiment, certain Jews gave passages from their earlier history in more classical Hellenic form. We learn from Clemens of Alexandria[2] and from Eusebius[3] that one Hezekiel brought out *The Exodus* as a Greek drama, a Philo wrote an epic poem on Jerusalem, a Theodotus another on the ancient history of Sichem (Samaria). The fragment cited by Clemens from *The Exodus* is a respectably written iambic passage on the early life of Moses, which is paraphrased closely from the book of Genesis.

The Letter ascribed to Aristeas, which gives a long account of the enterprise of the second Ptolemy in having the Law of the Jews translated into Greek, has been hitherto unanimously set aside as a worthless fable. Yet it was certain that the body of the Old Testament had already been produced in a Greek version in the middle of the reign of the ninth (really the seventh) Ptolemy, that is to say in the middle of the second century B.C. For the Introduction to *Ecclesiasticus* states this in a way not to be gainsaid. Hence Grätz and others thought that the reign of Philometor (Ptolemy VII.), who was a friend of the Jews, is the most likely moment in

[1] Cf. this point discussed in my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* i. 417, note.
[2] *Strom.* i. 414 *sq.* [3] *Prep.* ix. 20, 22, 24, 37.

which to place the beginning of the work. Now its date has been shown by Freudenthal to be even older, for the LXX. is cited in fragments from the Jewish historian Demetrius, who seems not to have lived after the fourth Ptolemy.

The characters of the third and fourth kings do not suggest to us that any such undertaking was likely in their day. For my part therefore, led by the suggestions of Lumbroso, I have gradually come to the opinion that the general statement of 'Aristeas's Letter' is true, and that Philadelphus really ordered this undertaking, as he ordered the work of Manetho on Egyptian history. The author of the letter, whoever he was, shows in many small points, and in the use of special words (ἑκατοντάρουροι, πολυωρεῖν), that he was familiar with the language and habits of that particular moment in Egyptian history.

The whole question of the rise of the Hellenistic dialect, and of the LXX. as representing it, has been altered since the first publication of this book, by the discovery of the large body of documents which I have published under the title of the *Petrie Papyri*.[1] Here we find the language used in ordinary legal documents, and in everyday letters, very much purer and better than we had been led to expect—more correct than the official documents known as the Canopus and Rosetta inscriptions, far more correct than the Greek of the LXX. Hence it appears that, at all events in the remote province of the Fayyum, the colony of Greeks and Macedonians, gathered from all parts of the Hellenistic world, spoke a dialect remarkably pure and free from barbarisms.

Many of the solecisms of the LXX. are therefore to be ascribed to the ignorance of the writers, or perhaps still more to the influence of the original upon their style. But

[1] *Cunningham Memoirs of the Royal Irish Academy* vols. vii. and viii., with Appendix, 1891-93.

our scientific knowledge of the LXX. is only beginning, and we cannot dogmatise till the dictionary undertaken by the energy and influence of Hatch has brought all the facts before us. That there were many various hands in the work is certain. If they differed considerably in time, we know that Egypt declined very rapidly in the vulgar use of Greek, for none of the second-century documents which have survived (from Thebes and Memphis) are even fairly accurate in their diction. It is hardly possible that at these greater centres the Greek employed should have been inferior to that of the Fayyum at the same time. This problem then has now to be added to those which have already made the origin of the *Common dialect* so obscure and perplexing.

A great number of Egyptians must have learned this dialect, for as it was by no means the policy of the Lagidae to exclude them from all civil or military service, so Greek was always insisted on as the official language[1] except in private contracts, and most certainly no one could hold command in the army without speaking Greek. I have shown that the military caste of old Egypt was completely gone in Alexander's time, and there is little mention of it under the Lagidae.[2] But there must have been many of their

[1] This official dialect has been preserved to us in many bilingual inscriptions, and is distinguishable both from the spoken idiom of Alexandria, the clumsy attempts at style in the LXX., and the literary Greek of the Museum. It has been well compared to mediaeval Latin, both in its involved and long-winded sentences, and its conventional coinages of words. It occupied the same kind of place among the people of Egypt that Latin held in law-courts and churches in the Middle Ages.

[2] There is n ention of οἱ μάχιμοι in line 19 of the Rosetta inscription, but nothing to indicate them as a caste, and not as mere soldiers. To the special account in Polybius of the re-arming of the native Egyptians by the fourth Ptolemy, and their consequent turbulence and insurrections after they had proved themselves at the battle of Raphia, I shall revert when treating of his reign.

descendants with military inclinations, and the great armies kept on foot all through this century imply some drain on the native population, certainly for transport service, ultimately for the phalanx. Thus the army was a means of consolidation. Just as the Calabrian, Sardinian, or Piedmontese peasant is made an Italian by serving in the army, and seeing by experience what the unity of Italy means, so it was doubtless by service that many a Fellah of those days was taught some smattering of Greek language and manners, and some respect for the great new rulers who made his country so rich and splendid.

If, however, the military caste was gone, and gave Ptolemy no trouble, the priestly caste was still strong and formidable, either as an ally or an opponent. Nothing shows his wisdom more clearly than his conduct in this case. He had learned from Alexander the largest religious tolerance; indeed Greeks and Macedonians at all times seem untainted with the sectarian severity of Semite races, or even of the Persians, whose early contact with Semites may perhaps account for their religious exclusiveness. The Persians had found in the priestly caste of Egypt such an opponent as the English have found in the Catholic priesthood of Ireland, and had proceeded against them much as older English politicians proceeded in Ireland, by penal laws and confiscations. Hence the advent of Alexander was hailed by the priests as a delivery from bondage. The Lagidae did not indeed restore, as we have seen above, the large endowments of the Egyptian priesthood; still by securing them a fixed revenue, by building and restoring great temples, by offering great gifts at their altars, and by general respect and attention to the established religion, they revived the alliance of church and state, which is so necessary to every absolute monarchy.

But beyond these court favours there was something more to be done; if the kingdom was to possess an established religion, it could not be wholly Egyptian. The Macedonians, so far as we know, worshipped the same gods as the Greeks, but the Greeks, freethinkers as many of them were, must have their religious susceptibilities respected. This was done, in addition, of course, to the erection of local Greek shrines, by the famous importation of Zeus Hades from Sinope, and his formal identification with Sarapis.[1] There was something peculiarly suitable in choosing this god; for there was at Babylon a temple to a god so called by the Macedonians, and the worship is said to have been akin to that of the Syrian Adonis. At all events, as all these nations worshipped a god of the dead, there was not much difficulty in the identification. We should not forget the strong pantheistic current which had set in throughout Greece, and which finds expression in the then nascent Stoic system. From this aspect the gods of all nations, and the various gods of each cult, were only temporary or local manifestations of the universal One—the substance and spirit of the universe. Such views had from the earliest times been manifest enough in Egyptian literature, as may be seen from many extant hymns.[2] Let me add that as men's notions of the Divine government of the world are always a reflex of their actual experiences, or the ideal of their age, as to human government, so the Greek world, which had learned to comprehend how one man could attain universal dominion, was now ready to understand that all local and national gods were only the lieutenants, or

[1] See the details given by Plutarch *de Iside* 28, and in Tacitus *Hist.* iv. 84.

[2] See the discussion of the subject, with quotations from Egyptian texts, in my *Prolegomena to Ancient History* pp. 262 *sqq.*

perhaps the manifestations, of a single great king. There can be no doubt that the Eumolpid Timotheus, who had come to introduce the Eleusinian mysteries at Alexandria, and the Egyptian priests, such as Manetho, could find little difficulty in identifying whatever Greek god the politic dream of Ptolemy suggested with the popular Egyptian deity.

The whole story, as told by Tacitus and Plutarch, points to a secret discussion among the various priests, under the king's direction, and a deliberate assertion of signs and wonders to establish the amalgamated cult. So completely did religion enter into the statecraft of the Ptolemies! Accordingly we find the priests quite ready to publish their sanction of divine honours to these upstart monarchs, and this in Greek as well as in Egyptian. It was with a document of this kind—a priestly record in honour of a Ptolemy (V.) and a Cleopatra—that Champollion was able to break the seven seals which hid Egyptian literature from our search, so that to the Lagidae and to their policy we owe this inestimable benefit.[1] How completely they identified themselves with the hieratic art of their kingdom is clearly proved both by their extant additions to older temples, and by their new foundations, such as the now vanished temple at Esneh, built by the third Ptolemy, with a long account in hieroglyphic pictures of his wonderful conquests in the far East.[2]

The finances of Egypt under the first three Ptolemies are

[1] Champollion's *Précis du système hiéroglyphique* still remains a rarely equalled account of a great discovery by inductive reasoning.

[2] This temple, seen by Champollion and Rosellini, was not destroyed till about 1829, to supply materials for neighbouring buildings. There were no doubt many inscriptions both in Greek and Egyptian recording this Ptolemy's successes. Fragments of two only have as yet been found.

said to have been in a most flourishing state. Though the population of Egypt can hardly ever have reached 8,000,000 —a very high estimate—we know that the land was (and is) exceptionally fruitful, and that the inhabitants submitted without open complaint to very high taxation. But even this cannot account for the enormous sums alleged to have been stored in the treasury, the great armies kept on foot, and the gigantic court expenses. The cost of one great feast given at Alexandria was nearly half a million of our money, and if it be true that an army of 100,000—our authorities say over 200,000 men—was kept on foot, with ample commissariat appointments, as well as a large fleet, it is evident that this establishment, together with the expenses of a very luxurious court, must have demanded an enormous yearly budget. After the destruction of Tyre by Alexander, and the settling of so many Jews in Egypt, the whole course of Eastern trade must have been turned into Egyptian channels. All the preciosities of India and Persia came up the Red Sea, and through Alexandria into the Mediterranean. So did the treasures of inner Africa,—ivory, ostrich feathers, wild beasts — all the curiosities which are prized in a luxurious and ostentatious age.

Yet it is remarked by modern historians that the financial policy of the Ptolemies was no better than that of other military despotisms, and, like the Germans of the present day, they thought it necessary for their security to store up hoards of precious metals, away from use and profit, against the eventuality of war. In spite of this very Oriental proceeding, it seems clear that Egypt was not only solvent, but very rich, so long as it was ruled by able monarchs. Thus, with its comparatively small territory and its unwarlike population, it remained for a century more than a match for the immense empire of the Seleucidae, and for

the martial state of Macedonia under the Antigonids. It was only when a series of infants and debauchees succeeded to the throne, that these *rois fainéants* fell into financial and military difficulties.

The fact was that though Macedonia possessed native soldiers of a quality far superior to its rivals, the boundaries of its power were ill defined; it was perpetually subject to barbarian invasions from the north and Greek revolts in the south, while its very extended coast-line laid it open to the attacks of its naval enemies, notably of Egypt. The Seleucid kingdom, generally known as that of Syria, commanded a vast population, or series of populations, some of them indeed warlike, but most of them mere orientals in the received sense, so that not only were their vast armies of natives little better than the hosts of the last Darius, but revolts of whole nations were frequent, and difficult to subdue. Thus a small and compact kingdom, unassailable except in such outlying provinces as Cyprus and Cyrene, and ruling over a homogeneous population, or mixture of populations so ordered that separate fractions or races could not easily revolt,[1] assumed and maintained the first position in the Eastern world.

If ever a result of such magnitude can be distinctly ascribed to the genius of an individual, it may safely be affirmed that the clear views, the tenacious policy, and large sympathies of the first Ptolemy moulded the whole history of Egypt, and with it of Hellenism; and yet all our knowledge of his personality fails to corroborate these indirect

[1] That such revolts were possible we shall see presently in the condition of Egypt, when the native population looked to the mahdis of that day as their deliverers against Ptolemy Philopator and his monstrous taxation. It was to meet this danger that the succeeding king was proclaimed a god by the priests at Memphis (Rosetta stone). Cf. Revillout in *Rev. égypt.* ii. 1 *sq.*

but certain proofs of his genius. He was indeed an active and successful commander under Alexander, but in the staff of the great king he does not seem to have occupied the first place. Some were more popular, others more feared. Nay, if Arrian had not used Ptolemy's own account of the early campaigns, in which no doubt that general gave no carping or incomplete story of his own achievements, he might have seemed even less important.[1] I do not remember that in any of the personal anecdotes about Alexander, which are genuine, he ever figures prominently, perhaps because he was a very temperate man, and avoided the revelry which Alexander loved, and which must have worn out many strong constitutions besides that of the king.

But there are men whose greatness only comes out in their life-work, who are no heroes to their valets or to anybody else around them, but make a permanent figure in history. The greatness of these men, which consists in discerning and directing all the greatness about them, comes tardily to be acknowledged. Thus we had in our own day Victor Emanuel, who grew from a petty prince of Savoy into King of Italy, by slow and almost natural steps, and by utilising all sorts and conditions of men—Cavours, Mazzinis, Napoleons, Garibaldis, Popes. They came and went, they helped, died, revolted, but still his policy held its course. Such a man may Ptolemy have been. And just as silly people still have the stock-word in their mouths that Cavour, who died in 1861, made Italy, or in other words lived and advised till 1879, so there are still historians who tell us

[1] Ptolemy Soter has had curious fates as an author. While Arrian praises his *Memoirs* of Alexander as the soberest and most veracious book, his name was afterwards prefixed to the fables ascribed to Callisthenes, and there is extant (C. Müller *Praef. pseudo-Call.* p. xxvii.) an epigram on his ignorance and deceit from a mediaeval reader.

that Alexander, by founding a great city, foresaw and prearranged the complicated struggles and debates which Ptolemy fought and solved with patient and stubborn purpose.

But in all that has so far been said in this chapter the reader will have noticed, perhaps with impatience, the omission of far the best known claim of Ptolemy and of his capital to historic fame—I mean the foundation of the Museum or University of Alexandria, with its magnificent Library and scientific appointments. It was convenient to dispose of other questions before approaching this, which will naturally lead to a new subject—the literature of the Greek world in the first half of the third century B.C.

The idea of making Alexandria a centre, not only of commerce, but of letters, seems to have matured gradually in the mind of the king. So late indeed in his life was this step taken that many have ascribed it to his son, and called Philadelphus the founder of the Museum. But though our scanty texts are clear enough in stating this, the date of the foundation is nearly determined, years before the reign of Philadelphus, by the call of the philosopher Demetrius (Phalereus) to Egypt, where he helped the king's idea to take shape by his experience of the academies of Athens. The very name *museum*, which is still in Germany applied to literary clubs, points to an Attic origin. We have already explained[1] how a nominally religious cult gave security to the property of each school, and how each society of the kind at Athens gradually became an independent corporation, endowed by the founder and by his disciples. The State stood aloof, except at a few stray moments, when it interfered to repress or persecute. It was clearly out of the

[1] See above, p. 156, note.

question for the military bureaucracy of Egypt to tolerate a powerful intellectual force of this kind beyond government control and patronage. Hence from the first the endowment of the new museum was a state allowance, given directly by the king to each member. But for what?

Ptolemy was by no means interested in the spread of any special doctrine; he probably knew little, and cared less, about the differences of the Athenian schools. What he wanted was to have celebrated men thinking and writing at Alexandria, and he left it at first to the superior judgment of Demetrius, and perhaps to his own son, the crown prince, what the complexion of the school—if such we can call it—should be. It seems, therefore, that the king and his minister of education founded an institution more like an old college at Oxford or Cambridge than anything else of the kind. It was a foundation supported by the king, adjoining the royal buildings, in which there were courts, cloisters, and gardens, and a Common Room, or dining-room (*συσσίτιον*), where dwelt men selected for their literary and scientific eminence. They were under a provost or principal, who was a priest, and who was nominated by the king, but whose religious services in the college were apparently confined to the formal cult of the Muses, a feature borrowed from the Academy at Athens. It may serve to show the contrast of spirit between the republican Academies of Athens and the Royal University of Alexandria, that the priest of the Muses, who had the charge of the religious services of the Peripatetic Academy, and was for the time president in the Commons' Hall, was elected by the members for thirty days, on the last of which he gave an entertainment, partly by subscription and partly at his own cost. The ecclesiastical head of the Museum was nominated by the king, apparently for no short or fixed

period, but during royal pleasure. If this provost was also the high priest of Sarapis, we come to something like the days when an archbishop could control one of our colleges.[1] It is certain that he was not an Egyptian. We hear the names of no Egyptians mentioned as members of the Museum, and the Egyptian reaction upon Greek and Jewish philosophy which arose by and by certainly did not work through the Museum. This college, on the contrary, like our own ancient colleges, was rather a home of critical research and of erudition than of new ideas and of the advancement of knowledge. Its provost was probably no more important intellectually than the heads of houses are now at our universities. The endowed fellows were men of learning, still more men of critical habit, and sometimes great men of science. But they seem rather to have taught accurately what was known than to have ventured into new paths in philosophy or religion.

It is moreover tolerably certain that teaching and tutorial work were not among the early conditions of their appointment, just as in the foundation of old Oxford colleges there was sometimes a provision that the fellows should not be required to spend their energy in teaching, but should devote it to their own studies.[2] Yet, just as at Oxford this admirable provision gradually went out of fashion, and was discarded for the lower view of making the colleges advanced boarding-schools, so at Alexandria young men naturally gathered about the Museum, and the Fellows of that college were gradually persuaded to undertake

[1] Cf. the evidence of inscriptions cited by Bernhardy *Griech. Literatur* i. 540. Lumbroso supposes (*Écon. pol.* p. 202) that he was Chief Secretary to the king.

[2] This is so, for example, in the foundation of Queen's College, and appears in the modern history of All Souls, Oxford. Strabo never even mentions lecture-rooms or schools in his very brief description.

tutorial or professorial work. And this too determined more clearly than ever their function to be that of promoting erudition and not knowledge. In pure mathematics, starting from Euclid, in medicine and allied researches, in natural history, we may make exception, and say that the University of Alexandria did original work; but, on the whole, we can conceive thinking men in later Hellenistic days saying what they now say of our richly-endowed colleges — that the outcome has not been worth the cost.

The Museum of Alexandria can certainly vindicate itself before the world. Apart from the scientific side, which requires special knowledge to discuss, and for which I therefore refer to Mr. Gow's *History of Greek Mathematics*, the Fellows of the Museum, when brought together into a society by their intercourse with the second Ptolemy, whom many authors, following the tradition of Alexandrian flattery, call the founder, developed that critical spirit which sifted the wheat from the chaff in Greek literature, and preserved for us the great masterpieces in carefully edited texts.

This leads us to the second great literary foundation of Ptolemy, the Library, which with us is regarded as the appendage of an university, but at Alexandria was so novel and important as to eclipse the Museum. We never hear who the ecclesiastical provost of the college was. We are told, even in our scanty records, most carefully who were the chief librarians, and what they contributed to the perfection of their library. But we must imagine Europe with only one library, that of the British Museum, if we will realise the enormous treasure gathered by Ptolemy for the world of scholars. For centuries to come men depended upon Alexandria for their materials, and in spite of tyrants and conflagrations it remained the centre of the

world for erudition and for bibliography.[1] But it was for erudition that the inducement was so great; to philosophers not of the encyclopaedic school it was far less valuable, and we find that many celebrated men refused the nomination of Ptolemy. They were offered an additional inducement, that of being put on the foundation, and so living at the king's expense, but this was a weak point as well as a strong one in the Museum. Ptolemy would not make it an independent corporation, appointing its own fellows, but always a 'Royal' Museum, with its literary posts granted by the crown.[2] But to Demetrius the Phalerean, whose philosophy was like that of King Solomon, and embraced all animals and plants from the hyssop upon the wall to the

[1] Strange to say, there is but little evidence that learned men gathered from afar to study at this centre, and Seneca even says in a curious passage (*de tranq.* 9) that it was merely a matter of ostentation, not of use, like the great libraries in some of our great nobles' houses. That books were copied for the curious and sold to them is more than probable. Possibly the *daughter library* presently established contained a reading-room.

[2] This is still the weak point of most European universities, and was even reintroduced into England after the late Prince Albert brought his bureaucratic Teutonism into play in England. The failure of some of his foundations, especially that of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, is to be attributed to this establishment of state interference. From one point of view, indeed, Athens was more like Oxford or Cambridge, in spite of the curious analogies I have cited from Alexandria. The Royal University of Alexandria was altogether one vast set of buildings with grounds, holding a position similar to that held by Trinity College in the heart of Dublin, whereas we hear from travellers in the next century that the first places to visit at Athens were the gardens of the philosophic schools—separate foundations in different parts of the city or suburbs. People went round to look at them as they go to see Oriel and Magdalen and Merton at Oxford. Then as now the elegance of the gardening was a feature attractive to the cultivated stranger. And as time went on these separate colleges or schools with their gardens became as important to Athens as the colleges now are to Oxford. Athenian shopkeepers came to depend upon the crowd of students as affording a large and permanent body of customers.

cedar of Lebanon—to such a follower of the *particularism* of Aristotle this collection of learning on every subject must have appeared like a royal road to solve the secrets of nature and of man.

So the great Museum became the model to men who wished to found colleges. There were several more such houses founded at Alexandria, one for example by the Emperor Claudius, with the condition that his own historical works should be read through there publicly once a year. Then the Jews had a school there, and presently the Christians—all separate centres for study.

It seems therefore quite legitimate to compare this condition of things with the old English universities and their colleges. Foreign scholars writing about it are not familiar with these colleges, and therefore the analogy does not strike them. But though there were many points of difference—notably the very questionable advantage of the Museum being situated in a great capital, the adjunct to a royal palace, directly supported by annual royal gifts—the likeness is too strong to be evaded, and makes the history of this establishment of the deepest interest to English students.

Thus it came to pass that Ptolemy Soter gathered into his capital every kind of splendour. He had secured for it the most important monument of its kind in the world—the body and the tomb of the great Alexander,[1] which commanded the veneration of centuries, down to the debased age of Caracalla. He established the most brilliant palace and court, with festivals which were the

[1] Pausanias says expressly (i. 6, § 3; 7, § 1) that Ptolemy Soter entombed Alexander at Memphis, and that it was Philadelphus who brought the body to the *Sema* to Alexandria. If this be true, which I gravely doubt, there can hardly be a question that either Philadelphus did it as crown prince for his father, or that the latter was delayed by untoward circumstances from completing his purpose.

wonder of the world. He gathered all that he could command of learning and literary fame. And the city was adequate by the largeness and splendour of its external appearance. We have it described in later times as astonishing the beholder not only with its vastness—to wander through its streets, says Achilles Tatius, is an *ἔνδημος ἀποδημία,* taking a tour without leaving home—but with the splendour of the colonnades which lined the streets for miles,[1] and kept the ways cool for passengers; with the din and bustle of the thoroughfares, of which the principal were horse and carriage ways, contrary to the usual Greek practice; with the number and richness of its public buildings, and with the holiday and happy air of its vast population, who rested not day and night, but had their streets so well lighted that the author just named says the sun did not set, but was distributed in small change—*ἥλιος κατακερματίζων*—to illumine the gay night. The palaces and other royal buildings and parks were walled off, like the palace at Pekin, and had their own port and seashore, but all the rest of the town had water near it and ship traffic in all directions. Every costume and language must have been met in its streets and quays. It had its fashionable suburbs too, and its bathing resorts to the east, Canopus, Eleusis, and Nicopolis; to the west its Necropolis.

[1] Colonnades were a distinct feature of Hellenistic cities, notably Alexandria and Antioch, in the latter of which they are especially described. The modern reader who desires to feel the effect of this will find it in the city of Bologna, where most of the streets are built in this way. The result is a great development of *echoes,* which sound very strangely through the quiet hours. This peculiar sound must be appreciated to understand Polybius's famous narrative of the riot at Alexandria (xv. 25 *sq.*), and seems to me also implied in Apollonius Rhodius's description of night (iii. 748-9), *οὐδὲ κυνῶν ὑλακὴ ἔτ' ἀνὰ πτόλιν, οὐ θρόος ἦεν ἠχήεις.* The early Roman Emperors copied this feature of Alexandria at Rome.

But of all this splendour no eye-witness has left[1] us any details. We are reduced to inferences and conjectures.

[1] It did not enter into Strabo's plan to give more than a very general account of Alexandria, and he has done it badly enough. The coronation scene in Polybius (xv. 25), to which we shall return in due time, is far more living and suggestive. Strabo tells us that the harbours at Alexandria were carefully guarded by ships, and that passports were required both for people entering and leaving. There can be little doubt that this precaution dated from Ptolemaic days. There must also have been guardships at all the smaller mouths of the Nile, for smuggling would otherwise have been possible on a very large scale. In one of the Louvre papyri we hear of natives being obliged to serve on these guardships, and in one of the British Museum there is mention of a police boat on the river. The Revenue Papyrus shows us that the state monopoly of oil was most jealously guarded against the competition of Syrian imported oil. These scraps of evidence prove that the commercial policy of the Ptolemies was far removed from the freedom which now prevails even in countries not addicted to Free Trade.

CHAPTER X

THE ALEXANDRIA OF PHILADELPHUS; ANTIOCH, ETC.

THE advent of Philadelphus[1] to the throne was hailed by all Egypt, as well as by Greeks and Macedonians, as the advent of the right successor to carry out the great policy inaugurated by the soldier of fortune. The eldest prince, Keraunus, was disinherited, and went into exile, where he soon justified the old king's rejection of him by his violences and murders, and after strange successes died in battle as King of Macedon. It was quite in keeping with the cautious clearness of the old man's policy to appoint his successor, and see him governing, before he died; though he probably made some reserve in giving away his kingdom, and did not actually take his place as a subject in the young king's household.[2]

This Philadelphus, then, succeeded about the age of twenty-four, and remained for nearly forty years the most brilliant monarch in the world. Most of the external evidence we possess declares him to be the actual founder of

[1] As is well known, it was not till long after this king's death that we find him distinguished from other Ptolemies by this title. His second wife was called Arsinoe Philadelphus in all state documents; he and she together the gods Adelphi. We know of no special title for him but Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy.

[2] Cf. the evidence on this point in my *Empire of the Ptol.* pp. 106, 488.

the Museum, and even if we reject these accounts as internally improbable, he was evidently from early youth so fond a patron of it, and so interested in its success, that all the literary men lauded him as the maker of Egypt's intellectual greatness. We can indeed show no really eminent names in connexion with the Museum in his father's day except the teachers of the young prince, Philetas, Zenodotus, and the Peripatetic Strato, who returned to Athens loaded with splendid gifts by his royal pupil. We have noticed above, however, how several great men refused the invitation. In Philadelphus's day the splendour of the Museum had so increased, the Library had been so marvellously enriched, and life in Alexandria had become so secure and pleasant, that all the wits were ready to flock to his court. The successors of Menander wrote their plays at Alexandria—we know of two, Machon and Apollodorus Carystius, who were considerable men—the leading scientific men collected there to prosecute their studies with the aid of the botanical and zoological collections,[1] as well as of all the wisdom to be found in books; and the art of bibliography and of criticism arose in connexion with the library. These, with the new developments of poetry, to which we shall return, made a world-epoch at Alexandria, and from this time Greek literature has been justly called Alexandrian; for not only was it the work of Greeks who had made Alexandria their second home, but the new character of all this literature was stamped upon it by the circumstances of the great city and the tastes of its royal patron.

He seems to have inaugurated his reign with a festival which surpassed all that had been hitherto known or dreamt

[1] On Philadelphus's desire to obtain strange beasts cf. Diod. iii. 37, concerning the capture of a great serpent; also Agatharchides in Müller's *Geog. Graeci* vol. i. Cf. pp. 223 and 308.

of in the world. The description of it was copied by Athenaeus [1] from the work of Callixenus on Alexandria, and is positively tedious in its splendour, in its long enumerations of gold and silver vessels, and of state chariots drawn, each of them, by some hundreds of men. To reproduce this curious text would be to fatigue the reader, but its general features are very indicative of the taste of the day, and will help to supplement what we shall gather presently from the contemporary literature.

The first thing that strikes us is the ostentation of the whole affair, and how prominently costly materials were displayed. A great part of the royal treasure at all courts in those days consisted not of coin but of gold and silver vessels, and it seems as if all these were carried in the procession by regiments of richly dressed people. And although so much plate was in the streets there was a great sideboard in the banqueting hall covered with vessels of gold studded with gems. People had not, indeed, sunk so low in artistic feeling as to carry pots full of gold and silver coin, which was done in the triumph of Paullus Aemilius at Rome (168 B.C.), but still a great part of the display was essentially the ostentation of wealth. How different must have been a Panathenaic festival in the days of Pericles! I notice further that sculpture and painting of the best kind—the paintings of Sicyonian artists are specially named—were used for the mere purpose of decoration. Thus in describing the appearance of the great pavilion [2] specially built for the banquet, Callixenus tells us that on the pilasters round the hall were one hundred marble reliefs by the first artists, in the spaces between them were paint-

[1] v. 196 *sq.*

[2] He calls it *σκηνή*, but it was all of marble, gold, and other solid materials.

ings, and about them precious hangings with embroideries representing mythical subjects or portraits of kings. We feel ourselves in a sort of glorified *Holborn Restaurant*, where the resources of art are lavished on the walls of an eating-room. In addition to scarlet and purple, gold and silver, and skins of various wild beasts upon the walls, the pillars of the room represented palm-trees and Bacchic thyrsi alternately, a design which distinctly points to Egyptian rather than Greek taste. It was probably no more than the two lotus-patterns (closed and open flowers) so well known in Egyptian architecture. The whole floor, we are told, was strewn with all manner of flowers, like a celestial garden, and then follows this interesting detail: 'For Egypt, on account of its good climate, and the care of those who grow what is rare and in blow at special seasons elsewhere, has flowers in abundance all the year, and neither rose nor white lily nor any flower is wont to fail them at any time.' This festival is said to have been held in winter, and yet there was abundance of fresh grapes to afford a vintage scene[1] on one of the great vehicles of the procession, where sixty satyrs trod the wine-press to the sound of the flute and song, with Silenus superintending, and the streets were flooded with the foaming must.

The Royal Zoological Gardens seem also to have been put under requisition, and we have a list of the various strange animals which joined in the parade. This is very interesting, as showing us what could be done in the way of transporting wild beasts, and how far that traffic had reached. There were 24 huge lions—the epithet points no doubt to the African or maned lion—26 snow-white

[1] In Egypt we know from the Petrie papyri that the vintage took place in the month Payni, which corresponded to our June, and came just before the inundation.

Indian oxen, 8 Aethiopic oxen, 14 leopards, 16 panthers, 4 lynxes, 3 'young panthers,' a great white bear, a camelopard, and an Aethiopic rhinoceros. The tiger and the hippopotamus seem to have missed this opportunity of showing themselves, for they are not mentioned. There were besides 24 chariots drawn by elephants, 14 by various antelopes, 60 by goats, 8 by wild asses. There were droves of camels bearing all the spices of Arabia-Felix; Nubians bearing 600 ivory tusks and 2000 stems of ebony, with endless gold dust (not coin) in gold and silver vessels. Then came 150 men bearing shrubs peopled with all manner of birds, and besides, in cages, peacocks, pheasants, guinea-fowls, and the like. Among them were 2 hunters, with 2400 dogs of Indian, Molossian, Hyrcanian, and other breeds. This zoological exhibition was, however, artistically introduced in that part of the show which represented the victorious return of the god Dionysus from his Indian conquests—a splendid gold and ivory figure attended by crowds of Sileni and satyrs with ivy and pine cones, carrying home all this spoil, and among it Indian and other foreign women, under tents in chariots in the guise of captives. It reminds us of the triumphal progress of Alexander after he had escaped from the deserts of Gedrosia.

But this great Bacchic show was only one of a large number of mummeries or allegories which paraded the streets;[1] for example, Alexander attended by Nike and

[1] The fashion of allegory in art is shown in a remarkable work of this time, already mentioned above, the *Calumny* of Apelles, in which he suggested his own history. Here is Lucian's account:—'Apelles, in commemoration of the dangers he had incurred, revenged himself upon Calumny by a picture of the following character. On the right sat a man with enormous ears, just like those of Midas, stretching out his hand to Calumny approaching him from a distance. About him stood two women—Ignorance, I suppose, and Suspicion—and from the left

Athene; the first Ptolemy escorted and crowned by the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and with Corinth standing beside him. Both gods and kings were there in statues of gold and ivory, and for the most part escorted by living attendants—a curious incongruity all though the show. But to represent either a god or a king by a living actor was perhaps thought unseemly. There came, however, in the beginning of the procession, an allegorical representation of *the Year*, given by a very tall man dressed in tragic costume and mask, with a golden horn of Amalthea in his hand. He was accompanied by an equally splendid female figure, surnamed the *Five-year Feast*, escorted by four Seasons carrying their fruits. There were attendant satyrs, and after them Philiscus the priest of Dionysus, and all the Company of the Tragic Theatre. This was what we should call legitimate or living mummery.

I have only cited a portion of this long and curious passage, to show what was thought taste and splendour in the Alexandria of Philadelphus. The procession lasted the whole day, being opened by a figure of the Morning Star, and closed by Hesperus. 80,000 troops, cavalry and infantry, in splendid uniforms, marched past. The whole cost of the feast was over half a million of our money. But

side Calumny is arriving, a very handsome female, but heated and excited, as it were exhibiting frenzy and rage, with a burning torch in her left, with the other dragging by the hair a young man stretching out his hands to heaven and appealing to the gods. A male figure leads the way, pale and unsightly, peering sharply, and like those who are reduced by a long sickness. You could guess it to be Envy. Two women follow in attendance on Calumny, setting her off and adorning her. As the cicerone told me, one of them was Conspiracy and the other Deceit. But behind them followed some one in deep grief, with black garb and dishevelled hair, I think she was called Repentance, and she was turning back in tears to look with great shame on Truth, who was approaching.'—Overbeck *Schriftquellen* No. 1874.

the gold crowns[1] offered by friendly towns and people to the first Ptolemy and his queen had amounted to that sum.

These extravagances might lead us to suppose we had before us another Sardanapalus. We hear, also from Athenaeus, of his many and famous mistresses, who were enumerated by one of his successors (Euergetes II.) in his memoirs. These women, of whom Athenaeus mentions five, were some of them Egyptian, some Greek, but apparently common people, flute-girls or dancers. One of them, Cleino, who served him with wine as his Hebe, was known all over Alexandria in statues representing her in a single under-garment with a pitcher in her hand. She was probably some beggar maid that this other Cophetua saw drawing water when she took his royal fancy.

There is much perplexity among historians why this king should have divorced his first wife, the daughter of Lysimachus, to marry her stepmother, also named Arsinoe, his own full sister, the widow first of King Lysimachus of Thrace and then of Ptolemy Keraunus, who had murdered her children, after she and he had murdered her stepson Agathocles, the rightful heir to Lysimachus. She was nearly forty years of age, a vigorous and unscrupulous politician, and owning, at least in theory, several towns on the Propontis and in Greece. It is supposed by Droysen that Philadelphus married her for the sake of this important dowry. I rather fancy he was led into this violation of all except Egyptian propriety because he knew he would find in her an able helper in his complicated and difficult diplomacy with the states on the Propontis and Black Sea, and

[1] This is an early instance of gifts to a royal personage under this name. It amounted to a formal tax upon the natives at the accession of a new Ptolemy, and was the forerunner of the *aurum coronarium* of the Romans.

because she was likely to leave him free to enjoy his amours without jealousy. It is certain that she interfered a great deal in public affairs, and that to her is due much of the character which the king gained for astuteness.

All his wars seem carried on by playing off one enemy against another, or by raising up diversions in the rear of an assailant, or by timely cession of points not worth disputing. For all the world was embraced in his view. He alone of the Hellenistic kings of that day had direct relations with both Romans (274 B.C.) and Carthaginians, and watched with keen interest the fortunes of the first Punic war. It was, indeed, quite clear that in this war friendly neutrality was his proper policy. Some years before, just after the return of Pyrrhus from Italy, Philadelphus had sent an embassy offering friendship and alliance to Rome. His proposal was received with the greatest eagerness by the Romans, and three of the noblest senators were sent to Alexandria to ratify it. They were entertained in the splendid style of the Alexandrian court, and no doubt the massive gold gifts which they brought home must have awakened in younger Romans a longing to demand some share in the riches of the East. But for the present the profits of the treaty fell to Egypt. Probably it was now that Puteoli became the free or privileged port of Egyptian trade, for here Alexandrian ships resorted ever after throughout Roman history. We can imagine what prices upstart Roman luxury paid for oriental refinements, and how advantageous to Alexandria must have been the supply of timber and wool which the Egyptians brought from Italy. At the same time, the Egyptian king took care not to break with the Carthaginians, who were indeed his most dangerous rivals in both western and southern commerce, and of still more importance on account of their influence on the coast

of Syria—his most anxious frontier. But when they asked him for a loan of 2000 talents during the first Punic war, he politely declined on the ground that it would be *helping friends against friends.*

If we add to these considerations the expeditions and foundations of cities undertaken in the south, in Arabia, and Aethiopia, we shall get some notion of the cosmopolitan character of the civilisation of those days. Hellenistic culture, it cannot be too often repeated, was so far like modern European culture that all those partaking of it had, or claimed to have, a certain superior type; and the countries on the boundaries, such as Meroe, Bactria, Cappadocia, were constantly striving to establish this claim.

To narrate in detail the diplomatic struggles of Egypt with Macedonia and Syria would be to write the history of the times, which is not here my task. The general character of these relations has already been indicated. Ptolemy, continuing the prudent policy of his father, held his own against Antigonus Gonatas by befriending the Greeks with counsel and money, sometimes by sending his fleet into Greek waters.[1] He likewise weakened the Seleucids (both Soter and Theos) by his interference on the coasts of Asia Minor, and his support of the Asiatic Greek cities. His enemies, on the other hand, constantly endeavoured to set up Cyrene against him, to defeat his fleet and take Cyprus, or to attack him by land through Syria and Palestine.

We cannot but infer from what is left us of evidence, that the second Ptolemy had in him an element of weakness, especially on the military side. He was too fond of pleasure

[1] In an extant inscription (*BCH* vii. 6) the σύνεδροι of the islanders thank the famous architect of the Pharos lighthouse, Sostratus, son of Dexiphanes of Cnidos, for his good offices with Ptolemy, probably this king.

and of curious research to be a great man of action. Apart from his lower amusements he loved to dispute with the dons of the Museum, to send out expeditions for rare plants and animals into far Africa or Arabia, to dispense splendid hospitality at his palace.[1] It is an index of the rapidly altering taste of that day, of the love for the new, as compared with the veneration for the old, that no king of Egypt was content with the palace of his predecessor, but built himself a new one beside it. Thus Strabo found a whole series of these palaces in the Royal Quarter; many modern capitals show the same extravagant folly. We are not surprised to hear that the king was a martyr to gout, and that when he saw the fellahs lying asleep in the sun, or eating with appetite their frugal meals as they lay, he exclaimed with sadness: 'Alas! why was I not born one of these!' But if it be true that he sought eagerly after the elixir of life, and hoped to find immortality by the aid of Egyptian magic and the occult lore of the priests,[2] we have here another proof

[1] The picture given (from pseudo-Aristeas) by Josephus (*Ant.* xii. 2, 7, 10) agrees fully with all that we have said, and represents the king neglecting state affairs, and spending his time in the workshops of the gold and silver smiths, watching their work, and superintending the designs of the offerings which he made to the temple at Jerusalem. The source of Aristeas's information is not known; but this sketch of the king has all the appearance of being authentic. We find in Philadelphus a figure strangely like the princes of the Renaissance, especially those in Italy, who combined virtues, vices, and love of the arts so marvellously. On the recently discovered stone of Pithom, commented upon and explained by U. Köhler (*Denksch. Acad. Berlin* for 1895), the priests narrate how the newly opened canal into the Red Sea was at once utilised by the king to send expeditions into the far south, and bring back rarities in fauna and flora for his pleasure. The famous expedition of Queen Hatasu, commemorated in her temple near Thebes, may have been his model.

[2] I have elsewhere pointed out that possibly the Buddhist missionaries who brought medical and metaphysical lore to the West may have excited these vain hopes

of the weakness of this prince, whom his circumstances had made so splendid, and whom a whole generation of literary men lauded to the skies. There is this, too, about him, which reminds us of the vulgar oriental despot, that immediately after his accession he put to death or exiled most of his immediate family. How different from the history of his contemporary Antigonus, or of the Attalids, who were so famous for brotherly affection! So I feel that, with all its splendour, the Alexandria of Philadelphus represents socially a worse court and worse morals than the cities of Hellenic antecedents.

We will devote a separate chapter to the literary men and their work, but may here remark that their separation from the populace was in all respects complete. The populace was walled out from the Royal Quarter (Bruchium), with its palaces and parks, its officials and its savants. It was pampered with largesses and shows, and kept in good humour by royal bounties; but at the same time it was sternly controlled by a large military force, and allowed no voice in serious affairs.[1] So the Alexandrians became under weaker sovereigns that dangerous, fickle, cruel mob so graphically pictured by Polybius in the next century. Let us now survey briefly the condition of the other states in the Hellenistic world—the kingdom of Antiochus, that of Antigonus, and the Greek states and cities which preserved the name of independence with very little of its reality.

The empire of the Seleucidae, and the characters of its kings, though perhaps of greater interest and importance in the world than those of Egypt, are far less known. Though

[1] I cannot find any mention of native Egyptians employed about the Ptolemaic courts till we come to the sixth king; and the seventh entrusted an Egyptian, Ptolemy Sympetesis, with the control of Cyrene.—Polyb. xxxi. 27.

the court of Antioch appears at some time to have founded both a museum and a library, we hear hardly anything of them. No literature that we know of arose under the Seleucids, if we except the important translation by Berosus, a Chaldaean high priest, of the annals of his country from the cuneiform records, which was dedicated to the first Antiochus. It was analogous, and no doubt in relation, to the translation of hieroglyphic records for the second Ptolemy, by Manetho, possibly even to the LXX. version of the Hebrew Scriptures. There are also other hints that Antiochus honoured and loved letters, and kept literary men about his court.[1] Concerning his personal character, however, after his romantic marriage (p. 75), and indeed concerning that of all his successors till we come to Antiochus the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes, we know absolutely nothing. The external frame of his life is full enough. We hear about his wars and alliances with Ptolemy, with Antigonus, with the Celts of Galatia, and with the several second-rate powers in the north of Asia Minor. He had succeeded to a stormy heritage, and found it impossible to hold together so vast and heterogeneous a dominion against able and warlike neighbours.

The kingdom of Syria, as it is called, but more properly the kingdom of the Seleucidae, was an ill-defined and ever-changing complex of nations, reaching, according to the genius of its actual ruler, from the Aegean to the Indus, or from the Cilician passes to the bounds of Mesopotamia. Antiochus had no uniform nationality, like the Egyptian, as a solid stock whereon to graft his Greek officials and mercenary soldiers, but swayed many various peoples, in all stages of development as to politics and manners. Hence the whole

[1] Aratus of Soli is said to have attracted his attention by Hymns to Pan, and to have been summoned to his court.

organisation of his kingdom is looser, his Greek cities have larger local privileges, his provinces semi-independent rulers. They make their own laws, furnish distinct contingents of troops, and live rather under the Persian than the Macedonian form of supremacy.

And yet not only was the court framed exactly after the model shown by Alexander, and a new capital made for the new kingdom, but there is evidence that Syria became the peculiar home of Hellenism to a degree that was never attained in Egypt. In Egypt Alexandria stood almost alone, and in the lapse of years Egyptian influences made themselves prominently felt even there. For the Egyptian type was tough and lasting beyond parallel in history. All through inner Syria, on the contrary, we find towns, rivers and mountains renamed after Macedonian memories; we must therefore assume that a large proportion of Macedonians settled in this country, and so the influence of Syrian Hellenism was deeper and lasted longer than that of Alexandria. Juvenal says it was the Syrian Orontes which flowed into the Tiber, and ultimately Antioch became a greater social and commercial centre than Alexandria.[1] It shows clearly the Hellenistic views of Seleucus that he founded a new capital here, instead of adopting either Babylon or Seleucia on the Tigris as his residence. He saw that not only were his dangerous enemies in the West, but that here also was the social centre of gravity, and that all the great commerce which enriched his treasury must have a secure outlet to the Mediterranean.

Antioch therefore was founded as a rival to Alexandria,

[1] If the LXX. represents to us the Greek of Alexandria, strangely enough the New Testament gives us our only large example of Syrian Greek. We can now considerably supplement the former by the very kindred though purer Greek of the Petrie papyri, written by the Macedonians and Greeks in the rich province of the Fayyum.

and competed with Alexandria in carrying the caravan trade of the East into the Mediterranean. The port town, Seleucia (on the Orontes), was carefully fortified and replaced the old marts of Tyre and Sidon on that coast. There was yet another distinct line of traffic developed by the Seleucids, and altogether in their hands—that from China across the Hindu-Kush to the sea of Aral and the Caspian, and so by the Black Sea into the Greek world. The silk of the Seres seems long to have followed this route, and this must also have been the case with the rare furs which were as much prized then as they are now. The country south of the Caspian, Hyrcania, was well known as of marvellous fertility, and the rise and importance of the kingdom of Pontus, in a region now obscure and forgotten, shows what wealth was developed there by the trade of the Hellenistic world.

But when we come to inquire into the social life of these many outlying members of the Greek world, there is deep silence. In later days we have sketches from Polybius, later still from Dion Chrysostom, but in this century there is no city known to us outside Greece proper, except Alexandria. There are still wars and rumours of wars; there are indications of trade and commerce, but of private life there is nothing. Inscriptions may yet supply us with some few details, but we can hardly hope to recover any real picture of the age. And yet how profoundly interesting would be such a picture! What should we not give for a view of Antioch in the days of its rising greatness, of Cilicia when it renewed with its hardy grafts the decaying tree of knowledge in Greece? We can see the reaction of Semitic creeds upon the vulgar, of Semitic seriousness upon the refined, among the western nations. The worship of Astarte and Adonis came from Syria; so did the deepest theology

of the Stoic system. But how, and through whom, and when—all this seems lost for ever.

We are a little better informed concerning the character and court of Antigonus Gonatas, and the sort of life which men led in Macedonia and Greece. The external history of the time shows him to have been an earnest prince, wanting in the military genius of Pyrrhus and Demetrius, but far superior to them in character and endurance. The way in which he set to work, time after time, to reconstruct his kingdom, lost by defeat or shattered by invasion, is one of the most remarkable instances of stubborn determination in history. And though he was in the end rewarded by securing the kingdom of Macedonia to himself and to his heirs, he was all his life contending with but partial success against inferior men advocating inferior principles. There are many allusions in Diogenes Laertius which show him to have been a friend and pupil of the philosophers at Athens, especially of the Stoics, whose system was probably the creed of his life. He was no doubt convinced that a reasonable monarchy was the ideal form of government, but the coincidence of this principle with his interests makes it difficult for us to judge him securely. It is hardly possible that all the tyrants whom he supported in the Greek cities were men whose conduct was strictly Stoical.[1] And, moreover, how far his means of government were justified by the end in view, nay more, what that end really was, is not by any means certain.[2] If he really intended to save the

[1] Cf. the case of Aristotimos of Elis in Plut. *de mul. virt.* § 15, which seems to have been in the days of this Antigonus.

[2] The serious view of his character now taken by German historians should not blind us to the curious story of his capture of the Acrocorinthus, and his conduct on that occasion :—

Antigonus's passion for [this citadel] was not less than that of love in

civilised world by means of a strong Macedonian barrier against another invasion of hideous barbarism, and for this required the general support of Greece, we may excuse him for preferring one submissive tyrant to a mass of turbulent pauper tyrants in each Greek city. But in any case it was very loose Stoicism to make the end justify the means. We know that the governors he appointed over Greek cities were temperate and worthy men. Persaeus the Stoic, who commanded at Corinth, and lost his life there, is the most celebrated. So also we know that in this generation high-spirited and virtuous young men like Lydiades

its greatest madness; and it was the chief object of his cares to find a method of taking it by surprise when the hopes of succeeding by open force failed. When Alexander, who was master of the citadel, died of poison, which is said to have been given him through Antigonus's means, his wife Nicaea, into whose hands it then fell, guarded it with great care. But Antigonus, hoping to gain it by means of his son Demetrius, sent him to make her an offer of his hand. It was a flattering prospect to a woman somewhat advanced in years, to have such a young prince for her husband. Accordingly Antigonus caught her by this bait. However, she did not give up the citadel, but guarded it with the same attention as before. Antigonus, pretending to take no notice, celebrated the marriage with sacrifices and shows, and spent whole days in feasting the people, as if his mind had been entirely taken up with mirth and pleasure. One day, when Amoebeus was to sing in the theatre, he conducted Nicaea in person on her way to the entertainment in a litter set out with royal ornaments. She was elated with the honour, and had not the least thought of what was to ensue. But when they came to the point which led towards the citadel, he ordered the men that bore the litter to proceed to the theatre; and bidding farewell to Amoebeus and the wedding, he walked up to the fort, much faster than could have been expected from a man of his years. Finding the gate barred, he knocked with his stick, and commanded the guard to open it. Surprised at the sight of him, they complied, and thus he became master of the place. He was not able to contain his joy on that occasion: he drank and revelled in the open streets and in the market-place, attended by flute-girls, and crowned with flowers. When we see a man of his age, who had experienced such changes of fortune, carouse and indulge his transports, embracing and saluting every one he meets, we must acknowledge that unexpected joy raises greater tumults in an unbalanced mind, and oversets it sooner than either fear or sorrow.

Antigonus having in this manner made himself master of the citadel, garrisoned it with men in whom he placed the greatest confidence, and made the philosopher Persaeus governor.—Plut. *Aratus* c. 17 (Langhorne).

of Megalopolis made themselves tyrants of their native cities, acting upon the theory[1] of all the schools of philosophy, who seem to have agreed in their myriad tracts on monarchy (περὶ βασιλείας) that the rule of one man was the best form of government.[2] We see the same spirit in the Spartan king Agis, and then in Cleomenes, who was advised by the Stoic Sphaerus (Plut. *Cleom.* 12); we see the pale reflex of it in the theories which underlay the politics of the Gracchi, led by their Greek philosopher in after days.

But Antigonus, if he was indeed a Stoic, was still more a statesman. He opposed the calm calculations of policy to the chivalrous knight-errantry of such men as Pyrrhus,[3] who said he was an impostor, wearing the purple instead of his philosopher's gown. He encouraged at his court serious poets like Aratus, whose extant *Phaenomena* were composed in Macedonia.[4] He was surrounded not only by men of letters and philosophers, but by foreign politicians and soldiers; and if he did not order inquiries into the

[1] Plut. *Aratus* 30, and so Droysen iii. 413 rightly understands the case.

[2] There is a large selection of extracts from these tracts by Pythagoreans in Stobaeus *Flor.* ii. pp. 247-284, in which the theory of rule by the best man, in imitation of the rule of the world by Zeus, is amply expounded. Isocrates, Xenophon, and Plato also offer materials. The story told of Demetrius Phalereus advising the first Ptolemy to get and read the books on royalty (Stob. ii. 254, ed. Teubner) shows that this literature had already been collected. The Pythagorean Ekphantos is the authority most largely quoted; he was probably a contemporary of Archytas.

[3] This is the point of his exclamation when the death of his son Halcyoneus was announced to him. He blamed the youth for neglecting both his own safety and his father's commands.—Plut. *Consol. ad Apoll.* 33.

[4] Alexander the Aetolian, the poet Antagoras of Rhodes, and the well-known Hieronymus of Cardia (in his old age) are also mentioned as living at his court.

wonders of tropical nature, like Ptolemy Philadelphus, we may be sure he studied deeply the manners and ways of all the courts and cities within the civilised world. And this was the type of man created by Hellenism. We shall find it in the Attalids, we shall find it in Achaean leaders; it exhibits the cosmopolitan air which the prose-writers of that age affected.

But the people with whom Antigonus had chiefly to deal were not the easiest material for the development of these views. In the Macedonians he had indeed subjects differing widely from those of the King of Egypt, or from all those who were really subject to the court of Antioch.[1] Instead of sand-hills or desert or the lazy river carrying down its wealth amid tropical heats, through fields of golden wheat, we have in Macedonia alpine wilds, foaming torrents, forests of primeval timber, upland pastures with winter snows—the everlasting home of a free and bold race of mountaineers, given to war and the chase, and as shepherds despising the laborious tiller of the soil. All the splendour of their court never subdued a certain rudeness in these Macedonians; they never produced, that I can remember, a great man of letters. They seem to have acquiesced in the loss of some of their pristine liberties, and to have submitted to the tolerably absolute monarchy of their philosophic king. But then the position of Macedonia was that of a military outpost against barbarism; and among a nation of soldiers absolute obedience is easily transferred from the camp, where it is indispensable, to the homestead. Yet withal the Macedonian still went about through the Greek and Syrian world as the Englishman has been accustomed to go through Europe—the acknowledged superior in physique, and the citizen of a nation which had dominated the world.

[1] I except, of course, the wild mountaineers of Asia.

Macedonia never possessed what seems an essential feature of other Hellenistic kingdoms—a large and populous capital. The first condition for such a populous city is an extensive trade, and Macedonia was precluded from this by having no transit route of the ancient world within her natural boundaries. Byzantium or Corinth would doubtless have become cities of the first magnitude, had Macedonian kings held permanent court there. But even then Corinth must always suffer as a literary and art centre by the proximity of Athens, whose supremacy as an university town could never be shaken, while Byzantium would have been prevented from reaching the same kind of greatness by the rise of Pergamum. So the ancient kingdom of Macedon remained without any distinguished capital—Aegae, the sentimental Residence, in its theatre of mountains, contained the tombs of her kings; Pella, nearer the sea, was made a court by Philip II.; but the mountaineers valued country life too dearly to gather into a town, and traders were few and despised.

If these people were patient and vigorous, though not very advancing, subjects, the cities and tribes of Greece, which Antigonus was striving all his life to incorporate into his kingdom, were of a very different type. They were far too clever to submit to his theories—nay, they applied them for themselves, and drew conclusions opposed to his interests. Thus it seems that the Stoic philosophy which inspired the king also inspired the patriots of Athens, when they rose under Chremonides (*circ.* 265 B.C.), and struggled for the last time to assert their ancient liberties.[1] Every-

[1] Antigonus conquered them by checking the advance of their ally Ptolemy's fleet, which he defeated signally at Cos. The confederacy of the Cyclades submitted to him after his victory over the Egyptians. Cf. the evidence in *BCH* vi. 160.

body who notices this war speaks of it as a noble and patriotic effort, but all these opinions rest upon the judgment of Niebuhr, who, as I have already said, was too personally concerned in this great question of politics to speak dispassionately.

Far more important, however, than the Chremonidean war, which Antigonus settled with moderation and kindliness, was the discovery or new application of the idea of Federal Cities, which presently grew so strong under the influence of Aratus in the Peloponnesus. Here was a practical solution of the difficulty of uniting democracy and liberty at home with strength and security in foreign politics. It was eminently successful too, as Plutarch remarks, so long as the members of the confederacy were able to refrain from the fatal Greek vice of jealousy—jealousy of those attaining high positions by talent and wealth.[1] The history of this federal idea in Greece, and its various realisations, must be read in Professor Freeman's remarkable volume. For political history, though entering everywhere into both social life and literature, is not the professed subject of this book.

If we want to form some notion of the life of the higher classes of that day in Peloponnesus, we must turn to Plutarch's *Life of Aratus*, probably the best of all his famous biographies. Being based on the *memoirs* of the Achaean leader, which were written down, he tells us, as a diary, this life is full of picturesque details which are hard to find in the artificial rhetoric of the day. But the acts of Aratus belong to a generation later than that which now occupies us, and there is some danger of attributing to nascent Hellenism the features it developed when well established. We shall

[1] *Aratus* 9.

therefore postpone our examination of the Greece of Aratus to a later chapter, and now consider the literature which burst forth brilliantly at Alexandria as soon as the second Ptolemy was established on his throne.

There was indeed everywhere an extraordinary burst of literary activity. Every philosopher or public teacher of that time—Zeno, Cleanthes, Metrodorus, Aristo, all the people whose lives Diogenes Laertius has given us, wrote scores, nay, hundreds of works, so many indeed that we must regard each of them as a mere tract, composed and circulated as men now circulate public speeches or lectures, especially of a polemical character. Chrysippus and Epicurus seem to have consciously aimed at a reputation for polygraphy. These works were preserved too, and catalogued, as may be seen from the long lists in Diogenes, who lived centuries later.[1]

[1] Here is about a third part of the list of Chrysippus's works, which will suffice to show the reader what such a catalogue was:—*ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐνδοξότατα βιβλία ἐστὶν αὐτῷ, ἔδοξέ μοι καὶ τὴν πρὸς εἶδος ἀναγραφὴν αὐτῶν ἐνταῦθα καταχωρίσαι. καὶ ἔστι τάδε. Λογικοῦ τόπου θέσεις, Λογικὰ καὶ τῶν τοῦ φιλοσόφου σκεμμάτων, Ὅρων διαλεκτικῶν πρὸς Μητρόδωρον, ς′. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν διαλεκτικὴν ὀνομάτων πρὸς Ζήνωνα, α′. Τέχνη διαλεκτικὴ πρὸς Ἀρισταγόραν, α′. Συνημμένων πιθανῶν, πρὸς Διοσκουρίδην, δ′. Λογικοῦ τόπου τοῦ περὶ τὰ πράγματα, σύνταξις πρώτη. Περὶ ἀξιωμάτων, α′. Περὶ τῶν οὐχ ἁπλῶν ἀξιωμάτων, α′. Περὶ τοῦ συμπεπλεγμένου, πρὸς Ἀθηνάδην, α′, β′. Περὶ ἀποφαντικῶν πρὸς Ἀρισταγόραν, γ′. Περὶ τῶν κατηγορευτικῶν, πρὸς Ἀθηνόδωρον, α′. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ στέρησιν λεγομένων, β′. Πρὸς Θέαρον, α′. Περὶ τῶν ὁριστῶν ἀξιωμάτων πρὸς Δίωνα, α′, β′, γ′. Περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῶν ἀορίστων, α′, β′, γ′, δ′. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ χρόνους λεγομένων, α′, β′. Περὶ συντελικῶν ἀξιωμάτων, β′. Σύνταξις δευτέρα. Περὶ ἀληθοῦς διεζευγμένου, πρὸς Γοργιππίδην, α′. Περὶ ἀληθοῦς συνημμένου, πρὸς Γοργιππίδην, α′, β′, γ′, δ′. Διαίρεσις πρὸς Γοργιππίδην, α′. Πρὸς τὸ περὶ ἀκολούθων, α′. Περὶ τοῦ διὰ τριῶν, πάλιν πρὸς Γοργιππίδην, α′. Περὶ δυνατῶν, πρὸς Κλεῖτον, δ′. Πρὸς τὸ περὶ σημασιῶν Φίλωνος, α′. Περὶ τοῦ τίνα ἐστὶ τὰ ψευδῆ, α′. Σύνταξις τρίτη. Περὶ προσταγμάτων, β′. Περὶ ἐρωτήσεων, β′. Περὶ πεύσεως, δ′. Ἐπιτομὴ περὶ ἐρωτήσεως καὶ πεύσεως, α′. Ἐπιτομὴ περὶ ἀποκρίσεων, α′. Ζητήσεως, β′. Περὶ*

Together with this flood of special tracts, which now deluged the philosophic world, and which were written without regard to style, merely to express the views of a thinker, we have the historians of the day, who plumed themselves upon their diction and the ornaments of their narrative, and who, in contrast to the philosophers, wrote great encyclopaedias of history in long series of books. Such were those who followed in the steps of Ephorus and Theopompus—Timaeus, Philochorus, Duris, afterwards Phylarchus, and then Polybius, whose remains give us an idea of this kind of literature. Whether these works were intended as universal histories on a fixed plan, or merely as collections of antiquarian lore, they indicate the same desire as the controversial tracts of the philosophers—the desire of their authors to appear before the world as men of letters —the itch or mania of authorship. We have consequently

ἀποκρίσεως, δ'. Σύνταξις τετάρτη. Περὶ τῶν κατηγορημάτων πρὸς Μητρόδωρον, ι'. Περὶ ὀρθῶν καὶ ὑπτίων πρὸς Φίλαρχον, α'. Περὶ τῶν συναμμάτων πρὸς Ἀπολλωνίδην, α'. Πρὸς Πάσυλον περὶ κατηγορημάτων, δ'. Σύνταξις πέμπτη. Περὶ τῶν πέντε πτώσεων, α'. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον ὡρισμένων ἐκφορῶν, α'. Περὶ παρεμφάσεως πρὸς Στησαγόραν, β'. Περὶ τῶν προσηγορικῶν, β'. Λογικοῦ τόπου περὶ τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὸν κατ' αὐτὰς λόγον. Σύνταξις πρώτη. Περὶ τῶν ἐνικῶν καὶ πληθυντικῶν ἐκφορῶν, ς'. Περὶ λέξεων, πρὸς Σωσιγένην καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, ε'. Περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὰς λέξεις ἀνωμαλίας πρὸς Δίωνα, δ'. Περὶ τῶν πρὸς τὰς φωνὰς σωρειτῶν λόγων, γ'. Περὶ σολοικισμῶν, α'. Περὶ σολοικιζόντων λόγων πρὸς Διονύσιον, α'. Λόγοι παρὰ τὰς συνηθείας, α'. Λέξεις πρὸς Διονύσιον, α'. Σύνταξις δευτέρα. Περὶ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῶν λεγομένων, ε'. Περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν λεγομένων, δ'. Περὶ τῆς συντάξεως καὶ στοιχείων τῶν λεγομένων πρὸς Φίλιππον, γ'. Περὶ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ λόγου πρὸς Νικίαν, α'. Περὶ τοῦ πρὸς ἕτερα λεγομένου, α'. Σύνταξις τρίτη. Πρὸς τοὺς μὴ διαιρουμένους, β'. Περὶ ἀμφιβολιῶν πρὸς Ἀπολλᾶν, δ'. Περὶ τῶν τροπικῶν ἀμφιβολιῶν, α'. Περὶ συνημμένης τροπικῆς ἀμφιβολίας, β'. Πρὸς τὸ περὶ ἀμφιβολιῶν Πανθοίδου, β'. Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰς ἀμφιβολίας εἰσαγωγῆς, ε'. Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν πρὸς Ἐπικράτην ἀμφιβολιῶν, α'. Συνημμένα πρὸς τὴν εἰσαγωγὴν τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀμφιβολίας, β'. Λογικοῦ τόπου, πρὸς τοὺς λόγους καὶ τοὺς τρόπους συντάξεις. Πρώτη τέχνη λόγων καὶ τρόπων πρὸς Διοσκουρίδην, ε'. Περὶ

clear evidence that this enormous body of lost literature laboured under the defects certain to accompany that well-known form of human vanity—self-consciousness in style, a morbid desire to appear original, and the vices of bitter criticism and of savage literary feuds. To be accused even once of plagiarism, especially when the accusation was true, rankled in the minds of these Greek professors as a lifelong disgrace, to be revenged by a series of attacks, both open and secret, upon the moral character, the veracity, the learning of the accuser. Thus we see a feature of our own learned world anticipated in this society.

But there is another main feature in which the difference between the two epochs is equally striking. When we see the enormous increase of short and cheap books under the Diadochi, we are led to think that literature must have been reaching the masses, that a lower class of people were beginning to read, and we might expect that in the

τῶν λόγων, γ'. Περὶ τρόπων συστάσεως πρὸς Στησαγόραν, β'. Σύγκρισις τῶν τροπικῶν ἀξιωμάτων, α'. Περὶ ἀντιστρεφόντων λόγων καὶ συνημμένων, α'. Πρὸς Ἀγάθωνα, ἢ Περὶ τῶν ἑξῆς προβλημάτων, α'. Περὶ τοῦ τὰ συλλογιστικά τινος μετ' ἄλλου τε καὶ μετ' ἄλλων, α'. Περὶ τῶν ἐπιφορῶν πρὸς Ἀριστογόραν, α'. Περὶ τοῦ τάττεσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐν πλείοσι τρόποις, α'. Πρὸς τὰ ἀντειρημένα τῷ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐν συλλογιστικῷ καὶ ἀσυλλογίστῳ τετάχθαι τρόπῳ, β'. Πρὸς τὰ ἀντειρημένα ἐν ταῖς τῶν συλλογισμῶν ἀναλύσεσι, γ'. Πρὸς τὸ περὶ τρόπων, Φίλωνος, πρὸς Τιμόστρατον, α'. Λογικὰ συνημμένα, πρὸς Τιμοκράτην καὶ Φιλομαθῆ. Εἰς τὰ περὶ λόγων, καὶ περὶ τρόπων, α'. Σύνταξις δευτέρα. Περὶ τῶν περαινόντων λόγων, πρὸς Ζήνωνα, α'. Περὶ τῶν πρώτων καὶ ἀναποδείκτων συλλογισμῶν πρὸς Ζήνωνα, α'. Περὶ τῆς ἀναλύσεως τῶν συλλογισμῶν, α'. Περὶ τῶν παρελκόντων λόγων, πρὸς Πάσυλον, β'. Περὶ τῶν εἰς τοὺς σολοικισμοὺς θεωρημάτων, α'. Περὶ συλλογισμῶν εἰσαγωγικῶν, πρὸς Ζήνωνα, α'. Τῶν πρὸς εἰσαγωγὴν τρόπων, πρὸς Ζήνωνα, γ'. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ ψευδῆ σχήματα συλλογισμῶν, ε'. Λόγοι συλλογιστικοὶ κατὰ ἀνάλυσιν ἐν τοῖς ἀναποδείκτοις, α'. Τροπικὰ ζητήματα, πρὸς Ζήνωνα καὶ Φιλομαθῆ, α'. Τοῦτο δοκεῖ ψευδεπίγραφον. Σύνταξις τρίτη. Περὶ τῶν μεταπιπτόντων λόγων, πρὸς Ἀθηνάδην, α'. ψευδεπίγραφον. Λόγοι μεταπίπτοντες πρὸς τὴν μεσότητα, γ'.—Diog. Laer. vii. 7, 13, §§ 190-195.

ruder literary work we should find a flavour of real life, of daily wants and habits, as distinguished from the ideal loftiness of the golden age of Greek writing. We should imagine that some of these many authors wrote for the people. And yet so far as we can judge this was not the case, for a very distinct reason. It was not the increase of letters within a fixed area, penetrating by degrees to the lower and more ignorant population, but the spread of letters over an enormously extended area, wherein were found a vast number of people of some education and with some desire for knowledge; hence there was not that unity of taste, that solidarity of public opinion, which reacts upon authors and creates a definite standard of style. There is, I believe, no trace of literature for the masses, of an appeal to the common people, in all these books.[1] They were written for the learned in Greek, for the higher classes who spoke Greek in the Hellenistic kingdoms of the East. To most of these people Greek was not their native tongue, and hence they never could become true judges of the really delicate features of that language. Even Aristotle had noted that you could always tell a foreigner, however fluently he spoke, by the use of the particles—an observation which we, who endeavour to write Greek prose, can fully appreciate. So then this whole literature, appealing either to the serious thinkers in Greece who openly despised style, as having consumed the energies of generations of literary men before them, or else to the outside Hellenistic world, on whom this kind of refinement was thrown away, affords us no masterpieces save those of Theocritus, which perhaps owe their unique position to the loss of all the models which he used. But what in our eyes is far more serious, it echoes no

[1] The romance on the life of Alexander attributed to Callisthenes is apparently the earliest thing of the kind which we know.

voice of the people, no genuine national spirit, no intense love or hate on broad human grounds. It is the literature of academies, the poetry of literary cliques, the criticism of pedants, at best the cold thinking of pure men of science. Nor are the pastorals of Theocritus any real exception. More artificial in their day than any of the other forms of poetry, though fascinating for their novelty and their perfect art, these poems give us no more idea of the ordinary manners of the lower classes in Egypt, in Kos, or in Sicily, where most of the scenes are laid, than the *Comus* or *Lycidas* of Milton do of the shepherd life of England in the seventeenth century.[1]

Yet even so this literature is not the less an index of some part of the life of that self-conscious and critical age, and is so little known even to the better educated among Englishmen, that some account of it will be to most readers at least a novelty. Among the hundreds of men who make Greek their study at Oxford and Cambridge there are probably not twenty who possess a text of Apollonius Rhodius, not ten who possess Callimachus—and yet these were once thought the foremost men in a brilliant age, and are representative of an epoch in Greek literature.

[1] The famous sketch of the Alexandrian women in the fifteenth idyll was borrowed from Sophron of Syracuse, a far earlier author. Cf. my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* ii. 170.

CHAPTER XI[1]

THE LITERATURE OF ALEXANDRIA UNDER THE FIRST AND SECOND PTOLEMIES

ἐν δὲ πλατυσμὸς
πουλυμαθημοσύνης, τῆς οὐ κενεώτερον ἄλλο.
TIMON.

IT is usual to say that time has completely robbed us of all the famous books written by the Alexandrian literati, and there are plenty of speculations as to how much poorer the world is in consequence, or whether the loss of this self-conscious, artificial, academic literature has indeed robbed us of a valuable compartment in the museum of letters. I am not sure that a charge of artificiality, however true and well established, is fatal to the greatness of any work of art, unless that work deliberately proposes as its aim something absolutely inconsistent with artificiality. The plays of Racine are in the highest sense artificial, and so

[1] Throughout the whole of this chapter I am constantly indebted to M. Aug. Couat's excellent book *La Poésie alexandrine*, and in this edition also to the exhaustive treatise of Susemihl (1892) on the literature of the epoch. This great work contains a perfect storehouse of learning on the subject. There are also studies by Knaack in Pauly-Wissowa *Encyc.*, and other authorities cited there (art. ALEXANDRIA). The great difficulty is to select from the myriad facts such as have a bearing on social life.

are those of Alfieri, despite their affected simplicity, and yet both are great monuments of literature, the disappearance of which would be a serious loss to mankind. A great part of the beauty of this world which touches and ennobles our lives is artificial beauty, or else natural beauty heightened by artifice; and it is only when the artifice becomes apparent and attracts our attention that we complain of it, because it spoils our enjoyment. Thus in Greek literature I suppose there are no greater authors than Aeschylus, Demosthenes, and, in the age before us, Theocritus, and yet all of them are highly artificial. They are all great enough to make the artifice subservient to deep and real human interests, and therefore they are not classed as artificial by the world of readers. Justly so too; but let the closer student examine any minute critic of their art, such as Westphal on Aeschylus, Blass on Demosthenes, or Fritzsche on Theocritus, and he will see the truth of what I say. All the Latin poets of the golden age were highly artificial, and the greatest of them, Virgil, was perhaps the most artificial of all; yet what poet has a sounder or a more widely recognised claim to greatness?

The contrast so often insisted upon in recent times between *classical* and *romantic* seems generally to imply this idea, that classical art adheres consciously to forms and precedents recognised as superior to ordinary nature, and therefore as ideal, while romantic art professes to reproduce the untutored and unregulated effects of nature.[1] There is in cultivated societies a perpetual oscillation as regards these two ways of affecting and improving aesthetic taste. There are times like that of Athenian greatness, of the classical Renaissance in Italy, and of Louis XIV. in France

[1] In Mr. Pater's Essay on the subject several other points of contrast are discussed.

when nature is regarded as rude and unfinished, requiring cultivation and alteration by civilised man before it can be regarded as beautiful. There are times of reaction against this, when the manners of primitive or savage men, the outlines of undisturbed country, the flowers of the field, are preferred to the produce of civilisation. Not only in successive generations, but in divers parts of the same society, at any moment, we may find this contrast living and working its results. There are those who recoil from attention to form, from the strictness of law in art, from the tyranny of training, from the fastidiousness of culture, and love what they feel to be spontaneous and unprepared. They think it over-civilised to take offence at faults of form, at discordance of detail, and plead that we lose half the enjoyment of life by insisting upon strict conditions in art. On the other hand, the votary of high culture will not admit that vulgar enjoyment of random beauty is to be called real love of art, or of beauty itself, in its highest and proper development, and will assert that no man can be said to enjoy in an intelligent way a picture, a poem, or a symphony, who does not know why it is beautiful, and does not comprehend the laws of its composition.

In a complex society like that of modern Europe, or of the Hellenistic world after Alexander, when the world is not only heir to the splendid art of earlier civilisation, but is working out new forms and learning new types for itself, we may be sure to find both these tendencies represented. But, as is usually the case, we find them both represented by literary men, to whom the reproduction of untutored nature was quite as much a conscious process as the reproduction of the defunct fables of old Greek mythology. So it has been in every great age, where the romantic has maintained its ground against the classical. The reproduction in art of the

simplest nature is, when successful, an outcome of the most deliberate study. Thus the poems in all Greek literature which approach nearest to romanticism are those of Theocritus, a savant of Alexandria, a courtier at the most artificial court in the world. If we want a specimen in prose we find it in that most studied of rhetoricians, Dion Chrysostom, who, in the middle of frigid panegyrics, of conventional moralities, of professional politics, gives us his idyll of shepherd life in the wilds of Euboea.

We may now return to the point from which we have digressed—the total wreck of Alexandrian literature. How far is it true? Only with considerable limitations. We still have, in the first place, the whole body of poems ascribed to Theocritus. Among these some in various metres and of various character may be spurious, but are certainly Alexandrian. This collection of poems is in itself no mean heritage. Then we have the *Hymns* of Callimachus, containing nearly 1100 lines, together with many fragments. We have the heroic epic of Apollonius Rhodius —the *Argonautics*—complete. We have the didactic epic of Aratus—the *Phaenomena* and *Signs of Weather*.[1] We have the *Alexandra* (or *Cassandra*) of Lycophron. We have the considerable and peculiar fragments of Timon the Sillograph. Among the collection of Greek epigrams a large number are explicitly assigned to these and other contemporary Alexandrian authors. So also the collection of Anacreontic poems—well known by the splendid printing of Parma and the versions of Thomas Moore—contain some early Alexandrian pieces, from which, indeed, we may be sure that the *genre* took its rise. Beside all these considerable specimens we have long and connected quotations from

[1] Though composed in Macedonia, this popular book cannot be kept apart from all the contemporaneous literature, justly called *Alexandrian.*

the elegies of Phanocles, of Hermesianax, of Rhianus's epic, and of Alexander the Aetolian, preserved in Stobaeus and Athenaeus.[1] Since this book was first published, we have recovered the mimiambics of Herondas, who may safely be classed with Theocritus as belonging to this branch of Hellenistic literature. We have not only a great deal of confessed imitation of Philetas in the Latin elegiac poets, but we have two poems of Callimachus, the *Ibis* and the *Coma Berenices*, actually translated into Latin; and the *Atys* of Catullus is doubtless a similar translation.[2] Indeed, up to a certain date, Latin poetry represents to us a second-hand literature which borrowed far its larger part, not from the greater classical, but from the then more popular and better known Alexandrian poets.

This is surely no inconsiderable body of documents from so distant an age, and it seems to me that, instead of lamenting the loss of the rest, we had better set ourselves to examine and weigh what we possess. This book is not intended to be a history of literature. Yet so ignorant are our educated classes of Alexandrian literature, that mere allusions or references to Callimachus or Apollonius are likely to be idle if we do not enter briefly into the documents themselves, and give some idea of the nature of their evidence.

At the very outset there arises a great difficulty in

[1] Cf. Meineke's *Analecta Alexandrina.* I omit in this catalogue the large body of mathematical writings still extant, which are no doubt the chief glory of Alexandria, but which cannot be ranked as literature. The reader will find a full account of them in Mr. Gow's *History of Mathematics at Alexandria*, and will be surprised at the number and importance of these books.

[2] To any one who has studied the relations of these Latin poets to their known Greek models, it is well-nigh impossible to conceive the *Atys* as an independent creation of Catullus. But we have no hint preserved regarding his model.

classifying these poems. Are we to proceed according to authors, and review the works of each poet separately? If so, we are obliged to consider epic, lyric, elegiac and other forms in the case of each, for it was the great aim and boast of all these men to excel in every kind of verse. On the other hand, if we propose to proceed according to style and metre, and consider the extant poems in themselves, without regard to authorship, we find that, as every poet tried every kind of poetry, the distinct species, so widely contrasted in the greater days of art, are now confused in their characters. The metre is no longer a sure key either to the subject or the treatment. The elaborate lyric metres of Pindar and of the tragic poets have indeed disappeared, but the hexameter hymns have become lyric in style, the elegy often epic and mythological, the epos dramatic. There is real confusion in form; and, as there was fusion of race and dialect, so the variations of both metre and idiom are now arbitrary and superficial, not deep and essential as they were in the older days.

Under these circumstances I feel justified in following the dictates of convenience, and, where we have a great number of fragments from different authors, all of the same sort, to regard them as exponents of the fashion of the age, and treat them as such, while I propose to consider as personal and individual the larger works, of which we have only single specimens, and these from distinct and known authors. Thus the elegy and the epigram may be handled as the general outcome and expression of Alexandrian art-feeling, while the mythological epic, the didactic epic, and the semi-political hymns may be treated as the work of their special authors. But in all cases our chief object is to find the traces of real life and feeling behind the mask of pedantry and of convention.

Among the books written by men of this epoch none attained wider popularity than the *Phaenomena* of Aratus.[1] Born at Soli in Cilicia, one of the centres of Stoic thought, the poet was, like most of the leading men of that day, attached to a court, but to that of Macedonia, and for a short while to that of Antioch, nor have we any evidence of his residence at Alexandria save the friendship of Callimachus, and the general character of his poetry. Suidas has left us a list of his works on all manner of subjects, not omitting the criticism of Homer. But we have nothing of all these treatises except the versification of the astronomy of Eudoxus, with extracts from the *Signs of Weather* of Theophrastus. It is a sort of 'Story of the heavens,' giving, in easy and fluent verse, an account of the division of the fixed stars into constellations, of the zones of the

[1] The epigram of Callimachus upon his friend shows us clearly the character of the poem, and its appreciation among the best judges of those days:—

> Ἡσιόδου τό τ' ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος, οὐ τῶν ἀοιδῶν
> ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
> τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε, λεπταὶ
> ῥήσιες Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης.—*Anth.* ix. 507.

As it may interest the reader to compare one of many passages in the *Diosemeia* copied by Virgil, that he may learn both to esteem Aratus rightly, and to see in another instance the delicate art of Virgil, I print the two passages in Appendix B. The points in these two passages which seem independent arise rather from Virgil's recasting the order of the facts. If there were space to do it, each single sign in Virgil could be paralleled from some part of Aratus's poem, so strictly and yet so poetically did Virgil copy his model. Strange to say, we have also from Cicero a version of the first lines, and then of a later passage (ed. Nobbe ii. 1333), which will show the reader the difference between the translation of a poet and that of a prose-writer. Fragments of a better version from Varro remain. Cf. the learned exposition of Susemihl i. 284, who omits all consideration of Virgil among the Latin imitations.

heaven, and the signs of the Zodiac. Even the ancients found out mistakes in Aratus's science,[1] and of course the newer system of Copernicus has made all his theory obsolete. But the constellations still keep their old fanciful names and their places,[2] and the signs of weather, adapted by Virgil with great grace in his first *Georgic*, are as good as the signs of weather now accepted as prognostics by the ordinary public. There is then still much interest to us in the poem, if it were only as a record of the knowledge attained in this branch of observation by the accumulated wisdom of the early Greeks. But the spirit of Aristotle, which dominated all the science of Alexandria, is upon Aratus, and though a Stoic in ethics, he has adopted in physics that love of minute and dry detail which marks the Peripatetic school. The sublime myths and visions of Plato give way to the dull enumeration of facts, to the *indexing* of nature, which his great pupil had introduced. So the *Phaenomena* wants the higher afflatus of Democritus, whom we know through Lucretius, where a great theory inspires the poet, and so transforms him that he is always splendid, whether in argument or in digression. The same art of exquisite digression relieves the tedium of didactic poetry in Virgil's *Georgics*; but Aratus never rises to such a level.

I fancy this difference is due not to the inferiority of the poet so much as to the temper of the age, and to the special

[1] The treatise of the famous astronomer Hipparchus upon this poem is extant, and has recently been issued in the convenient Teubner series by C. Manitius. There is a handy ed. (with the valuable scholia) of the *Phaenomena* by Bekker (Berlin 1828), and recently by Maas (*Aratea*, Berlin 1893).

[2] Most of these names were centuries older than Aratus, if we accept the curious evidence adduced in Mr. D'Arcy Thompson's *Catalogue of Greek Birds* (1895), whose names seem to have frequent connexion with the names of the constellations.

design which he had in composing his work. It is commonly supposed to be a popular handbook of astronomy. But this is too wide and vague a view. Consistent tradition affirms that he was summoned to the court of Macedonia, where, at the request of Antigonus Gonatas, he composed his famous work. Is it likely that this great practical politician, whose every act was subservient to the purpose of securing a solid and lasting dominion over the Greek peninsula, sent for a distinguished man to popularise the knowledge of the heavens among his people by way of general culture? I think not. A careful perusal of the *Phaenomena* will show a far more definite purpose.

If the old handbook of Hesiod was directed to the improvement of agriculture, and addressed to the farmer, so this book on the heavens is particularly addressed to the sailor, and intended for his benefit. And why? The whole conditions of navigation were changing with the spread of culture and the increase of luxury in the Hellenistic world. Formerly, as campaigns had been made by citizen-soldiers only during the summer season, so ships had only ventured over the seas in the fair weather, when the sky was generally clear, and the Mediterranean seldom disturbed, or only by a passing storm. But now the sea was dotted with barks carrying merchandise all the year round,[1] and men were

[1] *μὴ κείνῳ ἐνὶ μηνὶ περικλύζοιο θαλάσσῃ*
πεπταμένῳ πελάγει κεχρημένος. οὔτε κεν ἠοῖ
πολλὴν πειρήνειας, ἐπεὶ ταχινώταται εἰσιν·
οὔτ' ἄν τοι νυκτὸς πεφοβημένῳ ἐγγύθεν ἠὼς
ἔλθοι καὶ μάλα πολλὰ βοωμένῳ. οἱ δ' ἀλεγεινοὶ
τῆμος ἐπιρρήσσουσι νότοι, ὁπότ' Αἰγοκερῆϊ
συμφέρετ' ἠέλιος· τότε δὲ κρύος ἐκ Διός ἐστιν
ναύτῃ μαλκιώωντι κακώτατον. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης
ἤδη πάντ' ἐνιαυτὸν ὑπὸ στείργῃσι θάλασσα
πορφύρει ἴκελοι δὲ κολυμβίσιν αἰθυίῃσιν
πολλάκις ἐκ νηῶν πέλαγος περιπαπταίνοντες

ready to risk the fierce tempests of winter for the sake of rich profit and successful competition with rival traders. At such a season it was not possible to depend upon the Wain or the Polar star, which might be often clouded; men must be able to direct their course by a general knowledge of the heavens, so that a scrap of clear sky might serve them in dark and stormy nights.

It was probably for this great and increasing industry that the *Phaenomena* of Aratus were written, and it proved a valuable handbook.[1] There was no waste or digression in the work. It enumerated the known constellations, gave their relative places and the seasons of their rise and setting, with an account of the zones of the heavens, the received signs of weather, and all the information required in a nautical almanac of those days. It seems therefore probable that the book was suggested and encouraged by Antigonus for the special purpose of promoting Macedonian trade. He must have felt that it was in this that his kingdom was inferior to those of his rivals, and probably the Macedonians who took to commerce were inferior in knowledge to the men of Alexandria and Antioch who had old Egyptian and Phoenician traditions.

Not a little remarkable is the fact that Aratus omits in his catalogue all stars and constellations not visible in Greek waters, even though they were very prominent in the skies of Egypt, which he must have known perfectly well. Thus

> ἤμεθ', ἐπ' αἰγιαλοὺς τεταμμένοι· οἱ δ' ἔτι πόρσω
> κλύζονται· ὀλίγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον Ἀΐδ' ἐρύκει. 920

The scholia on this passage and also vv. 408-430 imply winter sailing. The crowd of epitaphs in the *Anthology* on the victims of the sea show but too clearly what risks were incurred in the pursuit of luxuries across the seas.

[1] Cf. the schol. on vv. 559, 730, 756, which insist upon this practical object in the work.

the star Canopus, the most brilliant fixed star next to Sirius in all the heavens, which becomes visible south of Rhodes, is, as his scholiast remarks,[1] never mentioned in the *Phaenomena*. No doubt the work of Eudoxus, written for Greek people, may not have included these southern stars, but we can hardly conceive Aratus to have been so slavish a versifier as to mention no star except those found in his model. It would rather seem to me that he composed his book with special and deliberate exclusion of anything which might serve Egyptian trade, and certainly not as a scientific treatise, in which case such omissions would have no meaning at all.[2] If further researches could show us that this tract was accompanied by similar practical books on husbandry and business, we might get a further insight into the wise rule of a great and good king. But, as a Stoic, we may be sure that he would patronise not literature and art so much as practical knowledge, and we need not regret this, at an epoch when the genius for literary form had disappeared.

A far greater astronomer, Eratosthenes, also composed (in the next generation) a poetical astronomy, which is unfortunately all lost but a few stray fragments.[3] Yet even in this man, from whom we should expect not only serious

[1] On vv. 351, 367, 498.

[2] Yet it is certainly remarkable how timid he is in breaking new ground. He deliberately shirks (vv. 454-461) all treatment of the planets as too difficult for him, and when he comes to fields of heaven which have not been occupied by the fancy of older astronomers, instead of inventing new constellations, like Conon with his *Hair of Berenice*, he prefers to leave many gaps in the list, and tells us that the stars are unnamed (vv. 367-385). In Callimachus's epigram upon the work it is the subtlety of style which is praised, as an advance on the poet's model, Hesiod, viz. χαίρετε λεπταὶ ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης.

[3] Cf. now also Wilamowitz *Ein Weihgeschenk des Eratosthenes*, explaining a poem on a mathematical problem in the *Anthology* in which there is a dedication to the third Ptolemy.

teaching but independent research, the Alexandrian fashions were so strong that we turn with greater respect to Aratus. For we know that Eratosthenes entitled his poem *Hermes*, and framed it on the model of those hexameter hymns which were of old known as Homeric, and which Callimachus also imitated. The birth and early adventures of the god were described, not omitting sundry homely scenes among the lower classes, which seem specially to have attracted these courtly pedants. Then came the invention of the lyre, and the ascent of Hermes to heaven, where he finds with wonder the harmony of the spheres, and describes the beauty of the heavens.

Yet even here, it seems, the Alexandrian fashion of telling love-stories came out, for in connexion with the unison produced by Kypris and Hermes there seems to have been a long digression in the passion of Hermes for the goddess, and their union in Egypt. A story of this kind seems to have been as necessary to any narrative poem of the day as it was to any drama produced in the days of Louis XIV. Racine could not rehandle the *Hippolytus* of Euripides without destroying its character by giving the chaste hero a secret flame, and obtruding the vulgarity of an ordinary love-affair upon the mighty passion of Phaedra and the virginal purity of Hippolytus. So Eratosthenes could not catalogue the stars and describe their paths without digressing upon their loves, and bringing up again a dead mythology to minister to the artificial taste of the day. This, as I have said, makes us the more admire the abstinence of Aratus, who, if he be dry and cold, is at least always to the point, and if often below the majesty of his subject, is always above vulgarity. This dignity is probably due to the Stoical principles of the man and of the honourable sovran whom he served. To his philosophy, too, we may

ascribe the high quality of the famous prologue, which, like that of Parmenides's philosophical poem, as well as of other didactic poets, ensured attention for the work. This prologue, though often cited and translated, may fairly find a place in Appendix C, that the reader may see for himself the best kind of work that was produced in the decadence of Greek literature.

As regards the practical use made of this book, it may be well to refer to a curious passage in Polybius,[1] where the importance of astronomy to strategy is expounded. It is there shown, probably in relation to the night-surprises carried out by Aratus of Sicyon, how it is inexcusable in a commander, who cannot foresee and guard against irregular phenomena, such as storms and rain, to be ignorant of those laws which determine the length of day and night, and the amount of moonlight on a fixed night. We must remember that they had no penny calendars to guide them, so that mistakes might easily be made. No doubt the handbook of Aratus was intended for this practical purpose also.

THE ALEXANDRIAN ELEGY.—As is well known, the ancient elegists among the Greeks applied that metre to all manner of serious subjects, and it was rather exceptional to find it as it appears in Mimnermus, an early poet whose amorous complaints were composed in the rhythm of martial and gnomic teaching. Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, and Theognis show clearly that any serious subject might be handled in this way, and yet the time came when *elegy* became absolutely confined to a single meaning, and was held to signify a lament, if not of disappointed love, at least

[1] ix. cc. 14-16, p. 679 *sq.* Susemihl (*op. cit.*) mentions the many commentaries of scientific men who knew that Aratus was a mere dilettante, but found his poem so popular that they regarded it as the best handbook for the public.

of disappointed affection. This is reported to have been the original meaning of the word in its supposed Phrygian home.

But in the great days of the perfected lyric systems and of dramatic poetry, the old elegy went out of fashion, and we know of no important representative of that kind of verse (beyond epitaphs and epigrams) except Antimachus of Colophon, a poet celebrated and decried, fashionable and forgotten in turn, but who certainly was great enough to set a model which had fatal effects on the Alexandrians. His *Lyde*, a learned and pedantic lament, in which he ransacked theogonies and mythologies for heroic parallels to his misfortunes in love, and professed to beguile his real grief by the recollection of unreal and shadowy tales, was known to good critics for its laboured learning and frigid effect, nor do we hear of its attaining any real importance till there arose a new and great generation of pedants, whom the altered fashion of the day prompted to sing of love, while all their training urged them to parade their erudition.

These two veins, then, ran through all the elegies of the Alexandrian poets, and it is hard to say which occupied a larger place in the minds of the writers. But while the extant Greek fragments are decidedly more learned than passionate, most of them being cited for their recondite lore, there is no doubt that their great legacy to posterity was the portraiture of passion, not so much by way of confession as of sympathetic narrative—in fact, they were the originators of the love novel which has gradually occupied so vast a field in modern literature.

Let it be understood that for the present I separate elegy from epigram, which will be considered apart. With this reservation it is surprising how little is left us of the vast body of elegiac poems in which Alexandria once revelled.

And what there is left is not by any means the most characteristic.

The *Bath of Pallas*, a poem written by Callimachus in Doric dialect for the feast of the solemn bathing of Pallas's statue at Argos, is distinctly a *hymn*, like his hexameter hymns to Zeus and Apollo, and is very properly printed together with them in all editions of the poet. So, too, most of the fragments from the Αἴτια, which was a famous handbook of antiquarian lore, in which the Muses on Helicon informed the poet as to the reasons of sacrifices, feasts, and ancient customs, the origin of cities and the derivations of names, are naturally of merely antiquarian interest. And in this very poem it was a digression which became the model for a great and endless mass of books. Digressions were, naturally, frequent, where a pedant full of various knowledge handled any subject, but still more because the Alexandrian poets knew well enough that their readers must have some relief from the dryness of erudition. All the hymns have a story in them, which, though in form a digression, is really the principal feature in the poem. So the *Hecale*, which we shall consider along with its rival, the *Argonautics*, had scenes of peasant life and manners introduced by way of homely relief.

But the capital digression in the elegiac *Aetia* was the love-story of Acontius and Cydippe. We have lost all knowledge of the special merits of the poet's treatment, but the twentieth and twenty-first Epistles (*Heroides*) of Ovid, a free imitator of Callimachus, and the prose *résumé* by Aristaenetus, give us all the main facts of this remarkable story —remarkable because we may regard it as undoubtedly the first literary original of that sort of tale which makes falling in love and happy marriage the beginning and the end, while the obstacles to this union form the details, of the plot.

It seems almost inconceivable that such a topic should have escaped the Greeks hitherto, and there are not wanting references to the *Kalyke* of Stesichorus,[1] the story of a maiden's hapless love and suicide. But neither this solitary and far remote attempt, nor the love affairs in the New Comedy, which start with the rape or seduction of the heroine, can be regarded as taking aught from the originality of the Alexandrian, unless, indeed, it be that the pure love of Acontius and Cydippe was in conscious contrast to the passions of Menander's stage.

There is only one possible source from which this new vein of sentiment may have been directly imported. We find many older Greek authors, who became intimate with Persian life, telling love-stories in which the constancy and the purity of female love was the prominent feature. These stories are of a different flavour from Greek love-stories. We have them in Xenophon (Abradates and Panthea), in Chares, where Zariadres and Odatis fall in love without even seeing one another except in dreams, and this was a most popular Eastern tale, also in Ctesias, from whom Nicolaus of Damascus retails the story of Stryangaios and Zarinaea.[2] I think it quite probable that among the other love-tales which were brought back from the campaigns of Alexander, and which were familiar to the many Persians settled in Egypt (as we know from the Ptolemaic papyri), there may have been a direct model for Callimachus's story. The tale of Chares is certainly of the same order, and expresses a delight in that modern theory, that two young people are born for each other, are marked out by destiny for husband and wife, and will be united in spite of all the

[1] Cf. my *Hist. of Greek Class. Lit.* i. 202.

[2] Cf. Xenophon *Cyropaed.* vi. 1, 33, etc.; Ctesias in Nicol. Dam. Frag. 12, *FHG* iii. 364; Chares, Frag. 17 in *Script. Alex. Mag.* Didot.

adverse circumstances which opposing parents and hostile conditions can create.

The tale of Callimachus ran in this wise:—

There were once upon a time two young people of marvellous beauty, called Acontius and Cydippe. [The poet did not proceed without describing fully this beauty, and exhausting himself in metaphors to express it.] All previous attempts on the part of any youth or maiden to gain their affections had been fruitless; and the one went about, a modern Achilles in manly splendour; the other, with the roses and lilies of her cheeks, added a fourth to the number of the Graces.[1] But the god Eros (now already the winged urchin of the Anacreontics), angry at this contumacy, determined to assert his power. They met at a feast of Delos, she from Athens, he from Ceos. [The details of their first meeting are either lost or were neglected by the poet.] Seized with violent love at first sight, the youth inscribes on a quince, which was a fruit used at this particular feast, 'I swear by Artemis that Acontius shall be my husband,' and this he throws at the girl's feet. Her nurse picks it up and reads the words to the girl, who blushed 'in plots of roses' at the oath which she had never taken. But she too is seized with an absorbing passion, and the situation is complicated by the ignorance or hardness of heart of her parents, who had determined to marry her to another man. Her grief prostrates her with sore sickness, and the marriage is postponed. Meanwhile Acontius flies the city and his parents, and

[1] This stock phrase (in later love-stories) meets us in an epigram of Callimachus on Queen Berenice (*Anth.* v. 146)—

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες· ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ κείναις
ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη, κἤτι μύροισι νοτεῖ
εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζηλος Βερενίκα
ἃς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ ταὶ Χάριτες Χάριτες.

wanders disconsolate through the woods, telling to trees and streams his love, writing Cydippe upon every bark, and filling all the groves with his sighs. Thrice the parents of the maiden prepared her wedding, and thrice her illness rendered their preparations vain. At last the father decided to consult the oracle at Delphi, which revealed to him the facts, and ordered him no longer to thwart the lovers. Acontius arrives at Athens. The young couple are married, and the tale ends with an explicit description of their happiness.

Here, then, is the first specimen of a simple love-tale, such as produced among the later Greeks endless imitations in prose and verse. We have still extant the *Hero and Leander* in verse, in prose the whole body of Greek novels, which ring everlasting changes on the same topic. We have it again in the *Metamorphoses* and *Epistles of Heroines* of Ovid. From them they pass into the early Italian tales, and so into the *Romeo and Juliet*, the Orlando and Rosalind of Shakespeare. From that time on we all know what universal sway the prose romance or sentimental novel has attained all over Europe.

But in its early and Greek development, not only did Callimachus originate the subject, he even gave a model for its treatment which dominated all his followers. M. Couat notices some of the points in this interesting piece of literary tradition. In the first place the *description* of the lovers is carried out to an extravagant extent, and the novelist tries to rival painting and sculpture in producing a portrait of his characters. This description—a stock chapter in Greek novels—was in most cases overdrawn, and fails to produce any clear image. Secondly, neither Callimachus nor his imitators turned to that curious psychological history of the growth of the passion of love which forms so important a

chapter in modern novels. Love comes suddenly, violently, at first sight, and generally by the direct interposition of the god Cupid, as we may see in Virgil's *Aeneid* in the case of Dido. So we have it in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, which is throughout an echo of a Greek love-tale handed down through Italian sources.

Hence the first meeting of the lovers is a capital point in the tale. Then comes, of course, the narrative of their passion, thwarted by circumstances among which the unsympathetic conduct of parents is doubtless the most usual.[1] The protector and go-between during the separation is the girl's nurse—here again we have Shakespeare; and the pangs of the lover are described just as they are described in the case of his Orlando—dishevelled hair, blackness under the eyes, disordered dress, a desire for solitude, and the habit of writing the girl's name on every tree—symptoms which are perhaps now regarded as natural, and which many romantic persons have no doubt imitated because they found them in literature, and thought them the spontaneous expression of the grief of love, while they were really the artificial invention of Callimachus and his school, who thus fathered them upon human nature.

But perhaps the newest of all the features in this forerunner of the Greek novel was the virgin purity of the maiden, and the importance of its preservation till the happy conclusion of marriage. In direct and noble contrast to the New Comedy, neither Cydippe nor any of the heroines in the subsequent novels would have any place or

[1] In the extant prose novels there is also a strong element of romance in the risks and adventures of voyage, and the visiting of strange lands, which marked the literature of Alexandria. The fables of the life of Alexander ascribed to Callisthenes are of this character, and such adventures become regular stock-in-trade among later Greek novelists.

interest in the plot, were it not that they victoriously elude or conquer the risks they encounter, through the force of their virtue or of circumstances. It is so in all the novels devoted to love by the later Greeks, and it may well astonish us that an age not remarkable for morality, nay, rather abounding in license both of living and of writing, should have laid hold with such interest of so noble a condition. The world they describe is not a moral world, still less was purity in women esteemed.[1] There are plenty of immoralities and violences abroad. But the heroine, like the lady in *Comus*, is to be proof against both dangers and temptation. It was therefore a real crown of glory left for Callimachus, to pro pagate this newer and higher view of life among men. The sounder instincts of the age embraced it. Even in the luxurious courts of the Diadochi such moral elevation was respected. Very possibly, too, the Stoic tenets so widely disseminated in those days had their effect in the acceptance of a stricter and more serious love of virtue. But whatever may be the causes the fact is plain. The love-tale or romance, turning upon the love, the separation, the reunion of two characters invented for the purpose, took its place in literature, and among a vast body of modern readers has supplanted every other form of fiction.

The Loves of the Heroines and other stories in Ovid and the Roman imitators show clearly that this maiden purity was no universal feature in the Alexandrian elegy. There were horrid stories of unnatural passions, and terrible tragedies of criminal love, celebrated in their accounts of mythical life. But it was the type of the Acontius and Cydippe which fascinated the age, and held its ground through changing generations.

In the *Aetia* then, this digression, for digression it was,

[1] Cf. Plut. *de frat. amore* xviii., on Eumenes and Attalus II.

became the most celebrated episode in the poem, just as in Virgil's *Aeneid*, or Apollonius's *Argonautics*, the love-story is read by many that take no interest in the rest of the epic. But the mythological lore, the explanation of local myths and customs—these were no doubt the chief subjects aimed at by the Alexandrian elegy. We can see this mixture of erudition and sentiment, of mythology and reality, in the poems of Propertius, who seems to be the closest imitator of Callimachus among the Romans.

But I must not forget to mention another curious feature in these poems, which is the habit of sketching realistic scenes from ordinary life. As if to vindicate themselves from the charge of antiquarian pedantry, these poets determined to show that they could paint human nature also, and in no case is this more curiously obvious than in the *Coma Berenices*, which Catullus has fortunately preserved for us in a very elegant Latin version. This occasional poem, composed by the laureate, as it were, to be a piece of delicate flattery to the reigning queen, celebrated the accession to the constellations of the lock of hair which she had vowed at the temple of Aphrodite in case of the safe return of her husband Euergetes from his famous Asiatic campaign. The new king had departed in haste, just after his marriage, but the way in which the poet describes the parting of the king and queen is so realistic as to be positively coarse and probably untrue, not to speak of its gross want of dignity; and in the close of the poem, when lauding chastity among women, he again speaks of the relations of married people in a manner very repulsive to good taste. But taste was not the feature of the age. In another elegiac poem, the *Ibis*, which Ovid has either translated or paraphrased—commentators are at variance about it—Callimachus showered all the vials of his wrath upon his rival Apollonius, who had

stung him with a smart epigram.[1] Even in his rage he could not lay aside his pedantry, and all manner of heroic and mythological punishments were raked up in the poem, as models of what he prayed might befall his enemy.

Thus we see the elegy used for satirical purposes, and if we add that in the *Bath of Pallas* we have not only Doric dialect but lively dramatic dialogue, we may regard it as proven that metre was no longer regarded as the peculiar vehicle for a particular kind of thought, but as a mere technical form in which a clever scholar could show any kind of ingenuity and of learning.

So far our notions of the Alexandrian elegy have been drawn from Callimachus, the best known and the most celebrated author of his time. But if the works of his fellows had been preserved, would our estimate have been raised? Was he more learned and consequently more artificial than the rest? Most likely not. We have a kind of presumption that Philetas, the earliest of this series, and to some extent their spiritual father, was better than his followers. He was called to Alexandria from his native Cos to educate the second Ptolemy, and was the master of Theocritus. While delighting in mythological and antiquarian lore, and devoting himself to love-poems—in this distinctly the head of the new school and not the last of the old—we can trace not only in his fragments, but still more in his pupil Theocritus, that bucolic vein, that love of the country and of external nature, which was certainly wanting in Callimachus. But we do not possess a single fragment of his containing more than a couple of lines, and we must be satisfied with the judgment of the Romans, who made him equal with Callimachus, and copied him with like assiduity.

[1] Καλλίμαχος, τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παίγνιον, ὁ ξύλινος νοῦς,
αἴτιος ὁ γράψας Αἴτια Καλλίμαχος.

Discounting single lines or words, we have from three more of these poets—perhaps less celebrated, but still great people in their day—three fragments of sufficient length to let us know that we have not lost anything very precious in this clever but laboured school of elegy. There is a passage preserved from the *Apollo* of Alexander the Aetolian, one of the men who organised the Library for the second Ptolemy. He was a fellow-worker with the 'dark' Lycophron, and a friend of Antigonus. He represents the god foretelling a story of guilty passion on the part of a young married woman, but narrates the facts without any real portraiture of character.[1]

A more interesting fragment on the death of Orpheus remains from Phanocles, a very unknown poet, who turned his attention to that romanic affection for youths which we see in Plato's *Lysis*, *Charmides*, and *Symposium*.[2] The legend is evidently told in order to explain, first, why Lesbos was so famous for poetical song; secondly, why the Thracians tattooed their wives. Thus we have the *aetiological* complexion of Callimachus plainly before us.[3]

Hermesianax is to us more important, for we have from him nearly a hundred lines of elegy, in which he gives an *enumeration* of all the poets of antiquity, to show that they had all suffered from the pangs of love.[4] His work, in three books, was addressed to his mistress Leontium, a necessary stock-in-trade for these bards, like the Lesbia and Cynthia of the Romans. She was a learned lady, or he pretended

[1] The reader will find it in Meineke's *Analecta* p. 219.

[2] Cf. my *Social Life in Greece* pp. 330 *sq.*

[3] Cf. Appendix D for the text, as well as the parallel passage in Virgil's *Georgics*.

[4] It is highly interesting to know that he even handled contemporaneous subjects; as in his story of Arsinoe, daughter of Nikokles, and her love-affairs. Cf. Susemihl i. 184.

that she was, and he entertained her, clearly in imitation of Antimachus,[1] with all this pedantry about gods and heroes, instead of speaking the simple language of reality. We know that he recounted the tale of Daphnis, of Polyphemus and Galatea, which we have, no doubt in far finer form, in Theocritus. Other love-stories of a very tragic kind are repeated from him in the collection of Parthenius.[2] This considerable fragment gives us perhaps the clearest evidence as to the character of the whole school. The poet is content to gather from the four winds of heaven any obscure story which answers his purpose; even Homer in love with Penelope, and Socrates with Aspasia, do not strike him as absurd. The whole situation is admirably summed up by Couat, whom I have so often cited throughout this chapter:—

A vrai dire, il faut se méfier. Adresser à une femme qu'on aime trois livres d'élégies où il est continuellement question de l'amour des autres, depuis l'origine des choses, et jamais du vôtre; lui parler toujours des femmes d'autrefois et jamais d'elle; dérouler patiemment un catalogue très complet, et même quelque peu grossi, de ce qu'ont dit les poètes les plus obscurs sur les héros les plus inconnus, perdre son temps dans ces efforts de versificateur érudit, ce temps si précieux, quand vous auriez tant de choses à dire sur elle, sur vous, sur vos plaisirs, sur vos ennuis, sur ces mille riens qui sont toute la vie; aimer une femme et lui écrire comme à un être abstrait sans couleur et sans forme; ce n'est pas ainsi qu'un vrai poète, un Catulle, joyeux ou désespéré, caressant ou brutal, parle de sa Lesbie.[3]

The text of Hermesianax is so unlikely to be found under the reader's hand—he may not possess a copy of Athenaeus

[1] Above, p. 252.

[2] This is a collection of prose love-tales, *Erotica*, culled from these poets in after days by Parthenius, who lived about 60 B.C. The story of Leucippus and Arsinoe is given by Antoninus Liberalis, and adapted with changed names by Ovid *Metam.* xiv. 698 *sq.*

[3] *La Poésie alexandrine* p. 81.

—that I shall consult his convenience by citing it in Appendix E.

It would be idle to delay over the wrecks of the learned love-poetry; let us pass to the epigrams, which will not detain us by any means so long.

THE EPIGRAM.—There is a great body of short poems extant under the title of the *Anthology*, which consists not of choice selections from longer poems, as the name might suggest, but of those brief sentences composed originally for inscription upon stone, then applied to more various occasions and purposes, but always retaining the mark of their origin in their name—epigrams. Old masters, such as Simonides, had been famous for composing in elegiac verse these inscriptions, whose merit was held to consist mainly in simplicity; but though tombstones, votive offerings in temples—in fact any monument which required commemoration—suggested and obtained epigrams, it was not till the Alexandrian age that the epigram became a literary fashion, and exercised the wit of the learned, not merely for actual inscriptions in temples and on tombs, or to claim the sympathy of the stranger who stopped to read them, but to show in smart and pointed form what the feeling, or rather what the art, of the writer was when he reflected upon the object of his epigram. For example, such famous statues as the Niobe or the Cnidian Venus call forth strings of epigrams; so does the statue of Alexander by Lysippus; and so again do pathetic or strange situations, such as the death of a bride, the loss of an only child, the grave of a misanthrope. The epitaph, I need hardly explain, is only a particular species of the epigram. But this and the votive epigram were the principal kinds until the sudden growth of amatory literature at Alexandria added the erotic epigram, wherein the lover poured out his joys, his

griefs, his satisfactions, his disappointments, in the neatest form with the most delicate conceits. We feel in most of these poems that it is no real lover languishing for his mistress, but a pedant posing before a critical public. If ever poet was consoled by his muse, it was he; he was far prouder if Alexandria applauded the grace of his epigram than if it whispered the success of his suit.[1]

The great body of the *Anthology* dates from an age posterior to that of the early Ptolemies, for when once this kind of poem came into fashion, which required no sustained genius, no high poetical gifts, and in which any literary man who got hold of a good point might make a name, it was practised with assiduity for centuries, and reaches down into Byzantine days. But we have sufficient remains of named epigrams by Callimachus, Rhianus, Asclepiades, Theocritus, to tell us that the real masters of this artificial school were the early Alexandrians. We are here again faced by our old difficulty of piercing through the veil of conceits and allegories and fables—for to them the old mythology was scarcely more—to the feelings of the real men beneath. The few who have read through the *Anthology* with care, like Mr. J. A. Symonds, write about it with enthusiasm, and the choice specimens which they cite seem to sustain their judgment. It is therefore very reluctantly that I confess a different opinion, and take sides with the great bulk of classical readers, by whom this collection of poems has been treated with neglect. No study seems to me more wearisome and profitless than the *Anthology*. There are, it is true, brilliant gems there, but in a bank of mud, or worse than mud. Not to speak of obscenity, there is such obvious

[1] The niceties of the metre used by these epigrammatists, who confined even their hexameters within limitations not dreamt of by Homer, are well explained in Rubensohn's *Krinagoras*.

artificiality, such posing, such false joy and grief, such sacrifice of substance to form, that the soul of the reader which thirsts after the real companionship of other souls is like the despairing Dido in her dreams,

> semper longam incomitata videtur
> ire viam et *Tyrios deserta quaerere terra.*

In two directions only do the epigrams of our epoch give us any insight into Alexandrian society. We learn from them the amount of direct personal flattery which was thought agreeable to both the king and the queen. The sacerdotal deification of the brother-husband and sister-wife finds its echo in the poetical deification by the court poets —a deification without modesty, without reserve or disguise. Even the hymns of Callimachus, as I have elsewhere shown, are only nominally hymns to Zeus or Athene, really they are hymns to Ptolemy. The other personal and real feature which comes out is the jealousy of literary rivals and the vanity of literary success. The controversial epigrams, if I may so call them, are far the most interesting in the collection. Unfortunately they are very few. But they are supplemented by the controversial allusions in Callimachus's hymns, and disclose to us a society more jealous and petty than that of modern pedants, where carping and criticising becomes so absorbing a pursuit that it kills the search after truth, and makes the accuracy which consists in avoiding petty mistakes more prized than the frank boldness of attacking unsolved problems, precision of form more prized than wealth of matter, the correct pedagogue more prized than the careless explorer.

TIMON OF PHLIUS.—Far more original than the didactic epic of Aratus was the mock epic or *Silloi* of the sceptical philosopher Timon of Phlius, who, after earning his bread as a stage-dancer, took to philosophy, and disseminated the

system of Pyrrho by his writings. He was the client, like most literary men of the age, of both Antigonus Gonatas and of Philadelphus, and was accordingly not only by training but in style of the Alexandrian period. His plan was to parody the visit of Odysseus to the Shades, and there to meet Xenophanes of Colophon, with whom he discussed men, and from whom he heard prophecies concerning all the famous philosophers down to his own time. His short and pungent descriptions of these men, as pungent as those of Carlyle, and as full of pregnant coinages of words, were constantly cited by Diogenes Laertius and Sextus Empiricus,[1] so that we have some 150 lines from his *Silloi*, together with some elegiac fragments. His sympathies and antipathies are, of course, strongest as regards his own contemporaries—praise of Pyrrho, contempt of Epicurus, still greater contempt of the hencoops of stuffed literary *capons* at Alexandria.[2] We cannot offer any opinion as to the philosophical power of the man, but his knowledge of Homer and his capacity as a critic not only appear from his ingenious and accurate parodies of Homeric style, but also from his advice to a brother critic, to trust to old copies of the poems, and not to the new revisions.

The school he represents speaks to us of the weariness of life and the despair of finding truth, so common in a

[1] *e.g.* ἄνθρωποι κενεῆς οἰήσιος ἔμπλεοι ἀσκοί.—
ἀμφοτερογλώσσου τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδνὸν
Ζήνωνος.—
κοκκυστὴς ὀχλολοίδορος Ἡράκλειτος.—
(Anaxarchus)—φύσις δέ μιν ἔμπαλιν ἦγεν
ἡδυνοπλήξ, ἣν πλεῖστοι ὑποτρείουσι σοφιστῶν—
(Socrates)—μυκτὴρ ῥητορόμυκτος, ὑπαττικός, εἰρωνευτής.
I cull these from many such phrases.

[2] πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ
βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται, ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες
Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ.

luxurious and decaying society, and yet his verses are far more lively and original than those of the poets who regarded their age as a brilliant advance upon simpler generations. Of course satire was much in fashion among these jealous and not very original writers. We have it not only in the savage *Ibis* of Ovid, but in many of the epigrams, where a pungent point could be made in a distich, and often produced a lifelong enmity. Timon is also credited with writing indecent verses (a style represented by a certain Sotades),[1] and though but one of his extant remains has any such stain, it is but too likely that the myriad activity of the age and the prurient search after originality would produce such aberrations or prostitutions of talent. We must remember also that such things, though revolting to refined minds of all ages, would not meet with that public censure which the diffusion of Christian morals secures for all literary uncleanness, even though it appeals to a large section of the worse kind of men. Yet for all that Timon interests us more than the strictly Alexandrian literati, in that he approached the deeper questions of the day in his serious moments, whatever his relaxations may have been.

The fragments of Timon afford fresh evidence of the confusion of styles of which we have already spoken.

[1] Fragments of Sotades are to be found scattered through Stobaeus, and are all moral reflections on the changes and chances of life, with scepticism indeed as to Providence. They are written, like his famous line on Philadelphus, which cost him his liberty, and probably his life, in the metre called after him Sotadean, constructed as three ionics a majore and a spondee (Tetrameter ionic a maj. brachycat.), but with various licenses. Cf. Clinton's note (*FH* iii. 500), which is a specimen of that author's care and learning. There is very little added by Susemihl in his recent account, i. 245. Here is the line most frequently quoted—

εἰς οὐχ ὁσίην τρυμαλιὴν τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς,

which has two trochees in place of the third foot.

Though his works were formally didactic, we can hardly hesitate, from the complexion of the fragments, to assert that they were mainly satirical, and yet for that purpose he chooses the heroic hexameter. In this he had old and excellent models. The sportive verses ascribed to Homer, such as the *Margites* and *Batrachomyomachia*, had also clearly a satiric intention, and so the poet might support himself by this high authority, as well as by the controversial tone usual in the older philosophical poetry. But when Callimachus makes a personal attack in the way of satire he does it (in the *Ibis*) in elegiacs, thus confusing the poetical tradition, and adopting a new metre for a subject properly to be treated in iambics. Regarded as philosophy, the *Silloi* were an attempt to preach reasoned truth in verse—an universal habit at one time in Greece, when, in fact, prose was unknown or undeveloped, but now long passed out of fashion, since Plato had treated the most poetical of systems in prose, and Aristotle had taught men to regard the matter only, and to despise the form, in philosophical teaching.[1] This late return to poetry as a vehicle for philosophy is not without its analogies elsewhere, as, for example, the *Fable of the Bees* and the *Essay on Man* in English literature. But it is rather the sceptical and satirical side of philosophy, the field of criticism, than the didactic side, which is suited to the vehicle of verse. Hence it is that this critical vein decidedly predominates in late philosophical poetry.

THE LYRIC POETRY OF ALEXANDRIA.—What we know of the lyrics composed by the men of the Museum is rather negative than positive. In the first place, we must define lyrical, in Greek poetry, not only as denoting a kind of subject, but still more as excluding certain kinds of metre. Thus the hymns of Callimachus, being in hexameters or

[1] Cf. my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* i. 127.

elegiacs, are excluded by their form from the category of lyrics, though their subjects might well have been treated lyrically. So also the epigrams, which are mostly in the same well-established metres, can hardly be classed as lyrical, which implies a form specially intended for musical expression and dancing, not for reading or recitation. What is properly lyric or melic poetry, as the Greeks called it, is either the school of Lesbos, the stanzas of Alcaeus and Sappho and the songs of Anacreon, or the choral performances of Alcman, Stesichorus, Pindar, and the musical *entr'actes* of the old Greek tragedy and comedy.

In the stricter sense lyric poetry had disappeared before the Alexandrian age, except perhaps in the form of dithyramb. The chorus of comedy was abandoned, that of tragedy reduced to a minimum, and we know of no school of singers who imitated, in later Athens, the acknowledged masters of Lesbos or of Thebes. It is likely that the complicated rhythms of Pindar even became unintelligible, and that without a trained chorus and suitable melodies they could no more be performed than a Wagner opera by amateurs.

Thus while strange metres were much affected at Alexandria, complicated sytems of metres, like those of Pindar, were never attempted. We do not know of any original development in this direction, except possibly the galliambic poems in honour of Cybele, which some recent critics hold to be of Alexandrian origin.[1] The famous *Atys* of Catullus has all the air of being a translation from a Greek original of this period, possibly of Callimachus, and there is mention in the grammarian Hephaestion of Alexandrian poems in this metre.[2] The *Atys* may be called strictly lyrical, its

[1] The number of extant epigrams on *Atys* show how popular this story was at Alexandria.

[2] The evidence is cited in Couat *La Poésie alexandrine*, pp. 195-7.

excited movement, its enthusiasm, and its peculiar form removing it from the staid lines of epic and didactic poetry. But all the metre is uniform, and it is suited rather to reading than to singing.

The lyric pieces, or what are called lyric pieces, left us in the collection of Theocritus are similarly in exceptional, but not complicated, metres, and are rather to be styled lyrical negatively, because they do not belong to any other recognised department.[1] They affect strange dialects, but just as Tennyson does, without any essential reason, and by no means as a natural effusion in the poet's own tongue. Hence these highly artificial exercises have attained no celebrity among the remains of the great bucolic master.

Far more popular are the love-songs handed down to us under the name of Anacreon, but which modern scholars have universally recognised as spurious, and as belonging to the later period of Hellenism. The inspiration of these poems is plainly that of Alexandria and its spirit. The Love-god, with his quiver and his bow, his wings and his fair cheeks, his flitting among roses and shooting privily at human hearts —all this now vulgar sentimentality owed its origin to the conceits of the city of the Ptolemies. The real Anacreon had a far different conception of that delight and bane of mortals.

But the real reason why a special school of lyric poetry in lyric metres did not thrive at Alexandria was that

[1] These little poems of Theocritus are numbered xxvii. and xxviii. in the collection, and are in (1) simple choriambics, like Horace's *Nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem*, or (2) in a mixture of glyconic and trochaic difficult to read metrically. As to subjects, the first is a graceful little address in Doric dialect to a spindle, which the poet was sending as a present to the wife of his friend Nicias; the second a love-complaint, in Aeolic dialect, to a beloved youth. The latter seems modelled on some such poem of Alcaeus, or other old Lesbian master; the former has nothing distinctive about it but its personal and occasional character.

other fields encroached upon the old domain of Pindar and Simonides. As M. Couat justly observes, the old Homeric hymns had been to some extent lyrics in hexameter metre, the epic or narrative form not being clearly distinguished from the lyric hymn or prayer or personal expression of sentiment. In the golden age of Greek literature these fields became widely separated, and marked by distinct literary forms, but in the decadence there was (as is often the case) a reversion to the old indistinctness, and so we find that the lyrics of the Alexandrians were not to be separated from elegy and epigram, nay, at times not even from hexameter poetry. This will appear more clearly when we turn to the examination of the only considerable remains of Callimachus, his once famous hymns, which are now well-nigh forgotten.

THE HYMNS OF CALLIMACHUS, OF CLEANTHES, AND THEOCRITUS.—If we compare what we know of Philadelphus, as regards policy, with what we know of his successors, we note his devotion to the Greek world, to Greek alliances, influences, and letters. In all the documents or fragments I have cited from his reign, there is not a single allusion showing any interest in Egyptian life, manners, or culture. Egypt, so far as these learned men mention it, means Alexandria, its palace, its Museum, and nothing more. We also know from Mr. Petrie's researches that he rebuilt the old Hellenion, or common temple of the Greeks settled for some centuries at Naucratis. This is exactly what we should have expected, but the evidence was not forthcoming when this book first appeared. But it is still more interesting to know from the text on the stone of Pithom, first discovered and published by Naville, that this king took special credit for endowing and rebuilding Egyptian temples, and for his care of the national religion. He even alleges what to

me is incredible, that he brought back from Persia the gods of Egypt, which had been carried away by the invaders of former time. His compliments to the priests are, however, much qualified by the facts recently disclosed in the Revenue Papyrus, that in his twenty-first year he ordered that all the dues from vineyards and parks hitherto paid to the gods, which amounted to one-sixth of the produce, were to be paid to his deified queen Arsinoe. This was probably a far greater sum than that spent in gifts to the priests, or even in building the great granite temple in the Delta, of which the ruins have been recently described (cf. Baedeker's *Lower Egypt* p. 441).

There are purely Egyptian statues of both king and queen, with a princess, who was probably his sister Philotera, in the Vatican Museum. Nevertheless the general complexion of this reign is that of a prince legislating for the dominant race of settlers in the country.

Probably the national reaction which caused such difficulties to the fourth and fifth Ptolemies, and which produced mahdis and prophecies and insurrections, had not yet set in. The Egyptians were at peace and in plenty. They had got rid of the hated Persians; and though the very first Ptolemy had made the fatal mistake of putting them on a different political footing from the Greeks, and under a special minister, they were not used to any greater liberty, and for the time seem to have acquiesced in the Graeco-Macedonian rule.

But even Philadelphus's son and successor, Euergetes I., a great conqueror, must have discovered the necessity of further conciliating the national priesthood, for the documents and buildings of his reign bear chiefly an Egyptian complexion, and the Greek remains, literary and otherwise, seem to grow scantier.

We may infer, then, that the main idea of Philadelphus—the incorporating of Egypt, as a mere feeder of Alexandria, into the Hellenistic fringe of the Eastern Mediterranean, turned out a failure; and so it is that the hymns composed by his laureate to promote this policy advocate a failing cause. For they were written to celebrate Greek feasts at shrines to which the king had sent precious gifts and favours, and under cover of the worship to laud the greatness and generosity of the King of Egypt. The adroit allusions to Ptolemy in these hymns are not mere flattery—they are intended to commend to the people of Argos, Delos, Ephesus, Cnidos, as well as to the many Greeks assembled at Alexandria, the benefits of a close alliance with, if not of submission to, the throne of Egypt. But, as has been observed by critics, we gain no agreeable picture of the king from his panegyrist. His power, his wisdom, his liberality, his victories over his enemies, are lauded, but there is nothing estimable or lovable told by the poet.[1]

It is almost amusing by what strained inferences he is made out one of the champions of Hellenism against the wild and barbarous Celts. In the great conflict which gained Antigonus the throne and Antiochus his title (Soter), Ptolemy had taken no part. Possibly he had been invited to help, and had looked on with traitorous indifference at the straits of his rivals and brother kings; but he presently did not scruple to engage some thousands of the savages against his relative, Magas, the dynast of Cyrene. These mercenaries formed, or were said to have formed, plans for seizing Egypt, so they were enticed into an island in mid-stream of the

[1] The story of Josephus, above mentioned (p. 223), about his attending the artist's workshops instead of doing more serious business, is, if true, more agreeable, but not inconsistent with what is said in the text. It is what worldly popes and princes in the Renaissance, who had little else to recommend them, are often reported to have done.

Nile, and in this prison, from which there was no escape, they were all killed or perished. This is the history which Callimachus, in his fourth hymn (171-188), identifies with the great defeat of the Celts at Delphi, and the heroic defence of the passes of Aetolia. Fortunately the real facts are preserved to us in a scholion on the passage, and so we are saved many wild conjectures.

The flattery in the second hymn (to Apollo) is even more portentous, for it is clear that the whole description of the attributes of the god is intended to apply to the now aging king, the founder of great cities, the healer of plagues, the source of wealth and prosperity. The poet even insinuates that the king is immortal, and has discovered that elixir of life which he long sought with pertinacious hope.[1]

But as regards the composition, there can be no doubt that the opening of the poem, with its agitation and excited address, is the best and most lyrical passage in all the hymns.[2]

This character, which is also seen at the opening of Hymn VI. (to Demeter), is by no means so prominent in them as that of epical narrative, if indeed that can be called epical which appears so frequently in the Odes of Pindar. I mean an episode in the legends of the god or hero told for the purpose of magnifying his power, and warning mortals against disobedience. The most remarkable and developed of these narratives in Callimachus are those of the mis-

[1] Athen. p. 536 e. Cf. on the whole subject the careful tract of Bruno Ehrlich, *de Callimachi hymnis* (Breslau, 1891).

[2] οἷον ὁ τῶ 'πόλλωνος ἐσείσατο δάφνινος ὄρπηξ,
οἷα δ' ὅλον τὸ μέλαθρον· ἑκὰς ἑκάς, ὅστις ἀλιτρός·
καὶ δήπου τὰ θύρετρα καλῷ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει.
οὐχ ὁράας; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δήλιος ἠδύ τι φοῖνιξ
ἐξαπίνης, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἠέρι καλὸν ἀείδει, κτλ.

fortune of Tiresias, who surprised Athene when bathing (v. 57-136), and the story of Erysichthon, doomed to perpetual hunger for his insolence to Demeter. The latter story, written in Doric dialect for the benefit of the Dorians who assembled to honour Demeter at the sanctuary on the Triopian promontory (near Cnidus), is distinctly comic in tone, and reminds us strongly of the idylls of Theocritus. Had it come down to us under that poet's name, it is likely that it would have attained to modern fame. For the narrative is very clever and poetical, while the humour of the thing is admirable. I will quote it in the Appendix (F), as it is a pity that so remarkable a specimen of Alexandrian poetry should be laid aside in oblivion.

This is the more to be regretted as the faults—and they are many—of Callimachus are well known, and often cited, perhaps at second (or more likely tenth) hand, to justify our complete neglect of this literature. We hear a great deal of his pedantry, of his lack of taste, of his love of detail at the wrong moment, of his want of a just sense of what is lofty and dignified. Thus Apollo prophesying to his mother before he is born offends us justly, and even where the verses are graceful something jars upon us, as in the passage where he describes the frightening of youthful goddesses when they are naughty by the threat of the bogey Cyclops, acted by Hermes blackened with soot.[1]

These defects did not prevent Catullus, Ovid, Virgil, and Horace from making Callimachus their model in many things, and surely the judgment of these first-rate poets, who

[1] οὐ νέμεσις · κείνους δὲ καὶ αἱ μάλα μηκέτι τυτθαὶ
οὐδέποτ' ἀφρικτὶ μακάρων ὀρώωσι θύγατρες ·
ἀλλ' ὅτε κουράων τις ἀπειθέα μητέρι τεύχοι,
μήτηρ μὲν Κύκλωπας ἐῇ ἐπὶ παιδὶ καλιστρεῖ,
Ἄργην ἢ Στερόπην · ὁ δὲ δώματος ἐκ μυχάτοιο
ἔρχεται Ἑρμείης, σποδιῇ κεχρημένος αἰθῇ.

had before them all the wealth of Greek literature, may well counterbalance the contempt of modern critics.

The last point I will here note about these hymns is, however, for our purpose the most important. What view of the religion of his day does Callimachus give us? As I said before, he was the Coryphaeus of the great reaction towards Greece which Philadelphus had learned from his Greek tutors. The great ritual, the mysticism, the pantheism of the old Egyptian priests seem perfectly unknown to him. He never thought for one moment of learning what they had to say upon the problems of the universe. Seeing that he lived when the government felt compelled to build great temples to the Egyptian gods, we might at least have expected some polite allusions to the fashionable policy of his paymasters. He was more concerned with discovering and retailing obscure local myths about the fading gods of Greece,[1] with explaining their obsolete epithets, and disseminating their often scandalous adventures, than in seizing upon the great new truths which were then being born into the world.

It was with the university of Alexandria as with other well-established and endowed universities. Formal orthodoxy[2] was its policy—orthodoxy, because many centuries had so accumulated myth and dogma that theology was a welcome and inexhaustible field to the learning of the pedant, to learning without originality; formal too, like that of the Cinquecento, for the learned would not deny themselves the pleasure or the liberty of sneering at earnest faith, and ridiculing the

[1] Perhaps better than any of Callimachus's hymns is that of Theocritus to Castor and Pollux (*Id.* xxii.), which is very dramatic, even introducing character dialogue, and narrating with great effect a famous episode in the acts of Pollux.

[2] Cf. his iambics on the sceptic Euemerus quoted by Plutarch *plac. phil.* i. § 7.

intellectual weaknesses of the faithful. These fellows and professors of the Hellenistic university were, in fact, orthodox because they were not religious, and because they preferred explaining religion as interesting archaeology to adopting it as a rule of life. Like the pedants of our own day, the greatest crime they knew was not to have done wrong, but to have made a blunder, to have been caught copying when they posed as original, to be outdone by a literary rival when they had laid down the laws of literary taste. All this is irreligious in the deepest sense.

How differently does the extant hymn to Jove of the Stoic Cleanthes affect us, especially if we compare with it the other scanty fragments left us by that famous philosopher! We may be sure that the Alexandrian literati found plenty of faults in its composition, and thought their own researches into the myths of Jove's birth, marriages, and adventures far more elegant and poetical. But we, who live apart from the controversies of that day, see in Cleanthes's famous hymn a splendid attempt to bring into harmony the author of nature with the traditional Zeus, and Divine providence with his will. There is no attempt to discredit orthodoxy, but rather to purify it, and use its elements of truth for a moral purpose. He prays, too, not for further learning to understand the stories of Zeus, but for further moral understanding wherewith to feel and appreciate the laws of God and the ways of providence in the ruling of the world. I will conclude this chapter with the text.

Κύδιστ' ἀθανάτων, πολυώνυμε, παγκρατὲς αἰεὶ
Ζεῦ, φύσεως ἀρχηγέ, νόμου μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν,
χαῖρε· σὲ γὰρ πάντεσσι θέμις θνητοῖσι προσαυδᾶν.
ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν, ἐνὸς μίμημα λαχόντες
μοῦνον, ὅσα ζώει τε καὶ ἕρπει θνήτ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν.
τῷ σε καθυμνήσω, καὶ σὸν κράτος αἰὲν ἀείσω.

σοὶ δὴ πᾶς ὅδε κόσμος ἑλισσόμενος περὶ γαῖαν
πείθεται, ᾗ κεν ἄγῃς, καὶ ἑκὼν ὑπὸ σεῖο κρατεῖται·
τοῖον ἔχεις ὑποεργὸν ἀνικήτοις ἐνὶ χερσὶν
ἀμφήκη, πυρόεντα, ἀειζώοντα κεραυνόν.
τοῦ γὰρ ὑπὸ πληγῆς φύσεως πάντ' ἐρρίγασιν,
ᾧ σὺ κατευθύνεις κοινὸν λόγον, ὃς διὰ πάντων
φοιτᾷ, μιγνύμενος μεγάλοις μικροῖς τε φάεσσιν,
ὡς τόσσος γεγαώς, ὕπατος βασιλεὺς διὰ παντός.
οὐδέ τι γίγνεται ἔργον ἐπὶ χθονὶ σοῦ δίχα, δαῖμον,
οὔτε κατ' αἰθέριον θεῖον πόλον, οὔτ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ,
πλὴν ὁπόσα ῥέζουσι κακοὶ σφετέρῃσιν ἀνοίαις.
ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ τὰ περισσὰ ἐπίστασαι ἄρτια θεῖναι,
καὶ κοσμεῖν τὰ ἄκοσμα, καὶ οὐ φίλα σοὶ φίλα ἐστίν.
ὧδε γὰρ εἰς ἓν ἅπαντα συνήρμοκας ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν,
ὥσθ' ἕνα γίγνεσθαι πάντων λόγον αἰὲν ἐόντα,
ὃν φεύγοντες ἐῶσιν ὅσοι θνητῶν κακοί εἰσι,
δύσμοροι, οἵ τ' ἀγαθῶν μὲν ἀεὶ κτῆσιν ποθέοντες
οὔτ' ἐσορῶσι θεοῦ κοινὸν νόμον, οὔτε κλύουσιν,
ᾧ κεν πειθόμενοι σὺν νῷ βίον ἐσθλὸν ἔχοιεν.
αὐτοὶ δ' αὖθ' ὁρμῶσιν ἄνευ καλοῦ ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλα,
οἱ μὲν ὑπὲρ δόξης σπουδὴν δυσέριστον ἔχοντες,
οἱ δ' ἐπὶ κερδοσύνας τετραμμένοι οἰδενὶ κόσμῳ,
ἄλλοι δ' εἰς ἄνεσιν καὶ σώματος ἡδέα ἔργα,
σπεύδοντες μάλα πάμπαν ἐναντία τῶνδε γενέσθαι.
ἀλλὰ Ζεῦ πάνδωρε, κελαινεφές, ἀρχικέραυνε,
ἀνθρώπους ῥῦσαι ἀπειροσύνης ἀπὸ λυγρῆς,
ἣν σύ, πάτερ, σκέδασον ψυχῆς ἄπο, δὸς δὲ κυρῆσαι
γνώμης, ᾗ πίσυνος σὺ δίκης μέτα πάντα κυβερνᾷς,
ὄφρ' ἂν τιμηθέντες ἀμειβώμεσθά σε τιμῇ,
ὑμνοῦντες τὰ σὰ ἔργα διηνεκές, ὡς ἐπέοικε
θνητὸν ἐόντ', ἐπεὶ οὔτε βροτοῖς γέρας ἄλλο τι μεῖζον,
οὔτε θεοῖς, ἢ κοινὸν ἀεὶ νόμον ἐν δίκῃ ὑμνεῖν.

The coincidence of line 4 with the famous phrase in Aratus's *Phaenomena* (Appendix C, line 5), quoted by St.

Paul, *τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν*, and the general likeness of the conception, shows how this quasi-monotheistic conception of Zeus was spread over the Hellenistic world.

This is worth far more than Alexandrian learning, and this alone would redeem the Hellenistic age as it now stands before us from the charge of mere artificiality and pedantry.

CHAPTER XII

ALEXANDRIAN LITERATURE—*continued*

THE EPICS OF ALEXANDRIA—THE IDYLLS, BUCOLIC AND DRAMATIC

In the scanty records which remain to us we have mention of a great literary quarrel, lasting for years, between Callimachus and his rival Apollonius, commonly called the Rhodian. It was a quarrel not only as to the respective excellence of their work, but still more as to the principles or rather the possibilities of Alexandrian poetry—Apollonius seeking to revive the ancient epic, with its large content and deliberate narrative of mythical adventure, while Callimachus thought the day for such things was past, and that the latter-day poetry of Greece should be in short pieces, in occasional odes, idylls, and epigrams; if in epics at all, in epics of an idyllic and homely character.

The leisure of life was gone, and the taste for enjoying quiet pleasures. Men were impatient in their recreations as well as in their labours. For who now would sit down and read through the *Republic* of Plato? The later philosophers felt this, and, enormously prolific as they were in writing, they published nothing but short tracts and pamphlets, to judge from the gigantic lists of their separate works.

It is certain that a self-conscious and artificial age in literature shows its weaknesses by violent admirations and dislikes, by cliques and partisanships, by anxious assertions of originality and bitter accusations of plagiarism. The work of a friend, of the head of a school, of an influential professor, is lauded from fear of his displeasure, from desire of his approval, as well as from real over-appreciation of his merits; and the work of rivals or opponents is decried from analogous motives. The loves and hates in the criticisms given to us by Mr. Swinburne are perhaps the most obvious instance of purely literary extravagance in such an age. To point to salient instances of worse literary jealousies or of literary adulation would hardly be excusable, however apt and valuable the illustration might be. This was clearly the temper of the literary hencoops of Alexandria, where over-fed and idle savants spent their time in criticising rather than in producing. They were to be divided broadly into the usual classes of conservatives and innovators, those who admired and sought to emulate the ancients, and those who thought the age and its temper had changed, and that other days demand another Muse. Homer, indeed, held a peculiar and unique place at the head of Greek literature, and though there were not wanting bold spirits like Zoilus, who thought him absurdly overrated, they were mere outsiders, like the stray atheist in a believing age, whose intellectual vagaries are regarded as moral offences. Homer was the Bible of the Greeks, to most of them verbally inspired, and containing all kinds of perfect wisdom.[1] But to imitate him would, on that very account, have been as absurd as to imitate the old sacred

[1] We even know that the earliest critical editors of his text, *e.g.* Zenodotus, dealt with it far more freely, and made far more emendations and alterations, than were sanctioned by their great successors.

books of any nation. Hence the literary models of the Alexandrian school were rather Hesiod, with his plain didactic manner and his wealth of mythological lore; Mimnermus, perhaps, as the father of the sentimental elegy, but far more Antimachus of Colophon, who combined love with learning, regret with research, and so claimed to possess the perfections of both Hesiod and Mimnermus combined. But above all things the new school felt that the length of the old epic and tragic poems was unsuited to an age of hurry and of idleness, of satiety and of the impatience that comes of weariness. To them 'a big book was a big nuisance.' If heroic subjects were to be treated, as they must be, in every learned age, it must be in short pictures, in epic idylls, where an episode was given in picturesque detail, but without boring the reader.

We have seen a similar change of taste in our own day. Such a poem as Milton's *Paradise Lost*, despite its acknowledged greatness, finds few voluntary readers nowadays, and no modern poet in England is likely to appear as an epic poet in that form. His work might be praised indeed, but would certainly not be read. At the same time there is a taste abroad for mediaeval romances, for the heroic lays of a simpler society. How did our late poet-laureate satisfy these apparently conflicting conditions? Instead of giving us a long epic on the life of Launcelot, he selects passages from the prose romance, and gives them to us in highly-wrought pictures, entitled with the strictest propriety *Idylls* or short pictures. The word has been associated by us so closely with Theocritus, that it has now a pastoral connotation, and an idyll seems to exclude epic grandeur and heroic character. But such an accident only obscures the history of the word. We have among the idylls of Theocritus epic poems, both in subject and style, such as the meeting of Pollux and

Amycus in combat, which are as like in character to Tennyson's idylls as is possible for poems twenty centuries removed.

The leader of this modern school at Alexandria was certainly Callimachus, as we know both from his own allusions and those of his rivals. But he naturally did not persuade all literary Alexandria. For there were those who still believed in the possibility of great sustained compositions, who thought that the old inspiration was not extinct, and that if heroic subjects were still highly popular, they should be clothed in their antique dress, and brought out with the calm dignity of epic narrative. The leader of this tendency was at one moment Apollonius, a pupil of Callimachus. With the boldness and inexperience of youth, he read out to the fastidious, censorious public, long educated by Callimachus, parts of a great poem on the adventures of the Argonauts, hoping by this publication to obtain the popular verdict for his great reform. But the Callimacheans were far too strong for him. They covered him with ridicule and crushed him with criticism. He replied with sarcasm and invective, but was obliged to retire to Rhodes, where he spent years in polishing and rehandling his *Argonautics*, which in the end were received with favour, when Callimachus was dead, though he can hardly have succeeded to the post of his old master, or even by the gentle irony of fortune have been laid beside him in his tomb. This great literary quarrel exercised all Alexandria in its day, and gave rise to many bitter epigrams and polemical writings.[1] If Callimachus censured the *Argonautics*, Apollonius ridiculed the

[1] I refer the reader for a fuller discussion to the last chapter of Couat *La Poésie alexandrine*, who has explored this special but very characteristic passage in Hellenistic literature, and now to Susemihl's more learned but less attractive discussion.

Aetia, and the older poet must have felt the opposition to be very serious when he had recourse not only to the legitimate argument of composing a modern epic to show what he could do himself, but to the scandalous weapons of personal and scurrilous abuse.

His positive essay in epic poetry was the *Hecale*, a very famous work, of which the plot has been reconstructed with singular ingenuity by Näke, but of which only scraps and single words remain.[1] His satire was contained in the *Ibis*, a poem copied, we do not know how closely, by Ovid in the extant *Ibis*, and certainly full of gall and bitterness. To judge from the curious errors of taste in Callimachus's religious poetry, we may assume his controversy to have been exceedingly coarse.

The loss of the *Hecale* is far more deplorable, as this was the best specimen of the idyllic epic, or epic idyll, devised and produced by the Alexandrian school. Hecale was a poor old woman, living in a cabin in Attica, to whom the youthful Theseus comes tired and hungry, on his way to contend with the Marathonian bull. The old woman, full of garrulous hospitality, prepares his supper while telling him of the varied misfortunes of her obscure life, and sends him forth with anxious prayers and good wishes on his adventurous expedition. When he returns in triumph he finds the neighbours engaged upon her funeral, and, full of pity and grateful remembrance, celebrates in splendid obsequies the virtues so long obscured by the hardships of poverty. This poem, while satisfying on the one hand the learned instincts of the

[1] The recovery of a fragment on a wooden tablet, published by Th. Gomperz (Vienna, 1893), now enables us to say somewhat more about it. There is an epigram by Krinagoras, *Anthol.* ix. 545, sent with a copy of the poem to the Roman Marcellus, upon which Rubensohn comments in his monograph on the poet Krinagoras.

day, by expounding a rather obscure myth about Theseus, and giving the origin of the Attic feast *Hecalesia*, on the other contained those homely pictures of daily life, those photographs, as we now say, of human nature, which have been so often popular in art. Of the four columns, each of 15 lines, recovered, only the first and fourth are fairly legible. The first, which seems to be the last in order, describes the crowding in and applause of the country people, when Theseus appears with the conquered bull; the fourth has a description of the dawn of day. Neither passage seems to me at all striking; the sense is clouded by ingenuities and obscurities of style, such as we suffer from in Mr. G. Meredith's prose, and likewise there is not any depth of thinking to reward us for our effort in understanding it. But this is not the verdict of the discoverers of it (among the Rainer papyri), or indeed of the editor, who exhaust themselves in praise of this new scrap of a once famous poet. Lest, however, the reader should be misled by my judgment, I print the two columns, which are not yet easily accessible, in my Appendix G. It is the *ῥωπογραφία* of later Greek painting, the school of Teniers or of Hogarth in older days, of the character-novel in our own. The most perfect specimen we have is probably the famous sketch of the Syracusan women at the feast of Adonis in Theocritus's fifteenth poem. But while Theocritus here reproduces contemporary life, Callimachus, as indeed Theocritus elsewhere, lays the scene in heroic times. We must go back to the *Electra* of Euripides to find anything like it in any older extant poetry.[1]

Such then were the theory and practice of Callimachus, Theocritus, and the most brilliant of the Alexandrians as regards epic poetry. But while almost everything famous

[1] Cf. my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* i. 360.

which they produced is long dead and gone, the poem of Apollonius, which Callimachus so earnestly strove to destroy, has survived. Next to the works of Theocritus it is perhaps the least forgotten—I will not say the best known—of the poems of that age, and though it more properly belongs to a later generation, it is so closely connected with the schools and tastes of Philadelphus, the phil-Hellene *par excellence* of the Ptolemies, that we may best consider it here. In my *Greek Literature* I have already given a short account of this considerable epic, and shall therefore rather supplement what is there said than repeat myself here. I may add that Apollonius is the most accessible of these Alexandrians, having been in this century edited with the very full and instructive Greek scholia, first by Wellauer, then by Merkel, with excellent *Prolegomena.*

There is a very general agreement among intelligent critics as to the merits and demerits of the *Argonautics.* No one who has studied the age can fail to remark that both in topics and in style the poet is the child of his day, and that at no age of Greek literature were men more absolutely dominated by the fashion of the moment. Taking up the famous legend of the Quest of the Golden Fleece, which had been in the mouth of every poet who treated Greek legends,[1] Apollonius thought that by gathering together the brief and fragmentary episodes, and building them into an epic of adventure, he could renew the glory of the old masters. But, as was sure to be the case, he believed too little and knew too much. The gods in his poem are only lay figures, with the manners of Hellenistic courts, and the appearance of famous statues or pictures.

[1] See the list enumerated by Couat p. 301, which includes almost every great poet from Homer to Euripides, and moreover Callimachus.

They really do not dominate the action, nor is the reason for the expedition, the old legend concerning Phrixus and his descendants, brought forward with enough clearness to justify the action. Thus the poem degenerates from a great moral or religious mission into a story of piratical adventure. But even here Apollonius halts between two opinions. Instead of delighting us with pictures of strange lands and curious people, instead of a poetical *anabasis*, like the great work of Xenophon, through remote and barbarous peoples, he feels tied down by his mythological lore, and will only describe to us the heroes and people for whom he has antiquarian authority. This it is which gives the character of a mosaic to most of his work; he is too learned, and too anxious to show his learning. He asserts that he has authority for every statement, and seems even painfully afraid of being taxed with originality of plot.

It was the day of romantic foreign adventure. India, Arabia, Abyssinia were being opened to commerce, and we know from the Greek novels and the romances about Alexander that the Hellenistic public had acquired a keen taste for this kind of literature. Apollonius therefore so far missed his opportunity. The complicated geography of his fourth book—the return of the heroes—is the geography of the seventh century B.C., not of the third. It is based upon old and dim legends, not on real discovery. The voyage up the Ister (Danube) into the Po (Eridanus), and so into the Sicilian Sea, is too monstrous to be received with anything but amusement. But the poet felt bound to insert without harmonising them all the episodes given by previous poets, who had treated the expedition from some special point of view. Accordingly he felt bound to bring the Argonauts round the fabulous north to Libya

on their way home, and has neglected the modern wonders of the world for the very stale curiosities of antiquated logographers.

A more serious defect resulted from this plan of composing a learned mosaic of adventure. It was impossible to subordinate all the disjointed action to the unity of character which makes an epic hero. Jason, instead of dominating the whole plot of the poem, is as much the plaything of circumstances as the pious Aeneas in Virgil's masterpiece. The hero is by no means the leader of men. He is really inferior to many of his followers, and is only superior to them in his dress and his good fortunes. This is indeed the case with Agamemnon in the *Iliad*, but then Achilles is the real hero of that poem, whereas there is no other character in the *Argonautics* who can take this place. Heracles is dropped out by an intentional accident, as being too great for a second part. Still the later Greeks had been accustomed by Euripides to second-rate heroes along with first-rate heroines. Such is that poet's treatment of this very personage, Jason, in his famous *Medea*, for all through his plays he seems to have been unable to draw a great male character, whereas many of his heroines — Alcestis, Macaria, Iphigenia — are not only unsurpassed in heroism, but specially contrasted with weaker men.[1]

This leads us to the great episode of Apollonius's poem, and one which will always give it a high place in its age; an episode, moreover, distinctively Alexandrian in character, so that the spirit of the age redeems on one side what it had lost on the other. If the geography of the *Argonautics* is its dullest side, there can be no doubt that the passion of Medea is its greatest and essentially Alexandrian feature.

[1] Cf. my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* i. 385.

Euripides had long since painted the jealous fury of her disappointment; it was left for Apollonius to treat the far more interesting romance of her nascent passion for Jason, and the great struggle of the maiden with the woman, of patriotism with passion, of duty with lawlessness, in the fiery princess.

There is no greater picture of this eternal romance in literature, and had the poet been content to produce it as a short epic, after the manner of Callimachus and Theocritus, it would doubtless have become as famous as the passion of Dido. The remainder of the *Aeneid* is indeed far superior to the remainder of the *Argonautics*, and has therefore deserved to live, but how many thousands are there who have read the love and death of Dido and who have no interest in the rest of the poem. Moreover, as we know of no model for the Medea of Apollonius, so we know of no model which can have inspired Virgil but this very episode. He was intimate with Apollonius, as with all Alexandrian poetry, and it was here that he sought that profound and pathetic psychology which appeals to the sympathy of every age. The Acontius and Cydippe, which we have already described, gave the common everyday version of the drama, which reaches into the poorest and most trivial life. Apollonius raised it from melodrama to tragedy, and yet a quite different tragedy from that of Euripides, whose Medea and Phaedra have no touch of the virgin purity which the Alexandrians felt to be the necessary starting-point of the love-romance in a refined society.

There is indeed, as there is in Virgil, much of the conventionality of the age. If in other respects the literary men of the day were godless, and the interference of Zeus and Here in the acts of men was only a survival in Hellenistic poetry, love-affairs were always represented under the

guise of the will of Kypris and the arrows of Eros. The mischievous urchin never fails to appear, and to shoot his dart into the heart of youth or maiden. The Alexandrians could no more construct a story without this assistance than the Renaissance lay out a garden without its Tritons and its Nymphs. This is the source of the same feature in Virgil, and is one of the many cases where conventionalism takes its place beside real and earnest pictures of life, and must be accepted as resulting from the essential *relativity* of art. There is in fact no age, especially no cultivated age, without its peculiar anachronisms, which we pass over as immaterial to the great truths which form the real body, and not the dress and fashion of art. The quaintnesses and conceits of some societies are graceful, of others not so, and perhaps the Alexandrians, in spite of Theocritus, were wanting in picturesqueness. But they observed the great passion of life with no lack of insight, and have left us a picture of it which must rank among the great things which the world of letters has achieved.

If then this episode might belong to any epoch among men, it is not less distinctly Alexandrian than those lesser features which many critics have noticed. There is the weariness, almost the despondency, under the many troubles of life, that world-sadness of which Euripides shows the earliest traces among the Greeks. There is also that preference of diplomacy to force, which appears not only in the speech of Aeëtes, but in the meeting of the goddesses, who hide bitter enmity under a garb of politeness. The gods indeed become more and more like Hellenistic sovrans, living at a court like that of the Ptolemies, and cloaking their absolutism with excuses of policy. The conflicts in the Olympus of Homer would have been unseemly beyond endurance to Alexandrian taste.

There is one feature which the poet seems to me to have borrowed from the older tragedy, and that is the strength of will and determined action of Medea as compared with Jason. Not that her mind is at once made up; far from it. The remarkable point is that while the weaker Jason never hesitates except from fear, the agitation of Medea, the coming and going of her resolve, even the bursting into helpless tears, are preludes to the most determined and ruthless action. In the long interview with Jason that hero makes no advances, and merely lets his beauty tell on the maiden, who is smitten to the heart by Eros. It is she who has to propose every plan; it is she who flies alone and unsolicited through the night, and hails the ship to take her on board. It is she who, to defeat the various efforts made by her father to recover her, supplicates, upbraids, and objurgates, while the heroes show her very lukewarm courtesy. This is truly the tragic feature in the story, that she who had saved them all from the certain vengeance of Aeëtes, and restored them to their home, should be a suppliant and a stranger among them.

Nor is the whole poem without a deep tinge of melancholy. No human joy is complete, no satisfaction without alloy. At the very moment of the consummation of happiness of the noble pair, while Orpheus and the nymphs are singing the bridal song around the nuptial car, the poet turns to his sadness. For with the peculiar chastity of Hellenistic love-stories, he had taken care to show that Medea's love was absolutely pure (iv. 1018 *sq.*), and that no temptation interfered with the very respectable plan adopted by both, that the princess should not be married to Jason till their return to Iolchos, where the ceremony could be performed with due solemnity (iv. 1161 *sq.*). But unfortunately on their reaching the court of Alcinous at

Phaeacia the Colchians were there to claim her, and Queen Arete had sent the Argonauts word, that if she were still a virgin the king must decree her extradition to her father's envoys. Hence the marriage is made in haste, and with what circumstance they found possible. But not a word is said of the sudden joy of Jason, of the eagerness of the lovers to attain the goal of their desires. No, nothing but the reflection that they were disappointed in their plan, that the nuptial night was celebrated in hurry and in fear, and that here as ever there is no such thing as perfect human joy.[1]

I noticed another very Hellenistic feature in the poem, which is the far-reaching policy of the kings, and the habit of cloaking their violences with diplomacy. Thus when Arete counsels Alcinous to neglect Aeëtes, because he is so far off, and favour their nearer neighbours in Thessaly, the king refuses, for in the first place, no one is more kingly than the Colchian, and in the next, however far off he dwells, he can easily raise them up difficulties in Greece (iv. 1100-1101). The speeches of Aeëtes himself, given in indirect narration (iii. 579 *sq.*), are similarly expositions of policy like the speeches in a Greek history. The respect with which Medea is treated when she appears in the street (iii. 885) is very different from the independent criticism of the Phaeacians upon Nausicaa or even Arete. In fact royalty was now a very different thing, and the heroic epic could not but be affected by the change.

[1] ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὔποτε φῦλα δυηπαθέων ἀνθρώπων
τερπωλῆς ἐπέβημεν ὅλῳ ποδί· σὺν δέ τις αἰεὶ
πικρὴ παρμέμβλωκεν ἐυφροσύνῃσιν ἀνίη (iv. 1163-5).

So far from love being the γλυκύπικρον of other Alexandrian poets, he regards it as an unmixed pain—

σχέτλι' Ἔρως, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στίγος ἀνθρώποισιν,
ἐκ σέθεν οἰὸλόμεναί τ' ἔριδες στοναχαί τε γόοι τε
ἄλγεά τ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἀπείρονα τετρήχασιν (iv. 445-447).

The only other long epic of the time, known to us by the prose paraphrase of Pausanias, is the poem on the second Messenian war by Rhianus of Crete. Pausanias's account of this famous war, and its splendid hero, Aristomenes, now forms the groundwork of far the most fascinating chapter in older Greek history, and we cannot but praise Rhianus, who had made special researches into the local antiquities of various cities, for selecting this truly epic subject. The long and wonderful conflict against superior force, ending in ruinous but glorious defeat, the gradual closing in of the enemy, the iron hand of fate checking and annulling human heroism—all this, which the exiled Messenians had kept alive as national tradition, and revived with the revival of their state under Epaminondas, was exalted by the poet into a remarkable epic. There are evidences, not only in the prose of Pausanias but in the fragments left us of the poet, that his style was simpler and more flowing than that of his brother poets. There are moreover touches in the story of Pausanias that evidently give us the actual treatment of Rhianus, and are very poetical. The dozen epigrams ascribed to him in the *Anthology* show much grace and elegance, but are very wanton in tone. Like all the Alexandrians he tried various *genres*, and no doubt prided himself upon the contrasts in his verses. These small and light effusions are therefore no clue to his serious style, which we only know directly from one passage, which I print in an appendix.[1]

In default of any further evidence on the longer epics of the conservative school, though no doubt many more existed, such as, for example, that which I have conjectured Pausanias to have used on the invasion of the Celts,[2] I turn to the

[1] Meineke *Analecta* p. 199, and Appendix H.
[2] Above, p. 170.

only extant, and probably the best, specimens of short epics, in the style of the *Hecale*, namely, those composed by Theocritus, and justly classed among his Idylls. For I have already explained that any short and complete poem, dramatic or descriptive, or both (but not lyric), is justly called an idyll. These poems have of course been suspected by German critics, because they differ very widely from the bucolic idylls, to which they show great contrasts in their composition. As if every Alexandrian author had not aimed at this very variety! Let us look at some of them for a moment.

The most remarkable is the account of Heracles's visit to the stables of Augeas (*Id.* xxv.), a poem of 281 lines, in which the hero's arrival, his colloquy with an old servant, his encounter with a bull that charges him on account of his lion's skin, and his own narrative of the affair of the Nemean lion to Augeas's son, who is struck with admiration of him, are all told with dramatic force and brevity. The work is essentially an epic idyll, complete so far as it goes, and evidently taken out of a longer legend, but requiring nothing more within itself. Hence it begins without a beginning and ends without an end.[1] Of course the pedants wish to supply a logical introduction and conclusion; they call it a fragment of a longer poem.[2]

[1] The opening is—

τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων προσέειπε, φυτῶν ἐπίουρος ἀροτρεύς,
παυσάμενος ἔργοιο τό οἱ μετὰ χερσὶν ἔκειτο·

the arrival of Heracles and his previous history being taken for granted. The end is the end of Heracles's tale to the boy with whom he is walking through a narrow lane among the vines. This tale is in fact the purpose of the poem, which is thus justified. This abrupt opening is not uncommon in the dialogues of Plutarch, *e.g.* the tract *de sera num. vindicta.*

[2] So I suppose, when future pedants come to edit Bret Harte's masterpiece *The Heathen Chinee*, they will print '* * * * which I wish to remark,' and tell you that the opening of the poem is lost.

Hardly less characteristic is the twenty-fourth Idyll on the prowess of the infant Heracles strangling the snakes sent against him by Juno. The domestic scene of Alcmena lulling the children to sleep in a great shield, presently the terror of the household, the screams of the mortal infant Iphitus, the hurry of Amphitryon with his sword, the attendants rushing in with lights, all this makes a picture unlike anything in Greek literature except the famous scene in the *Hymn to Demeter*.[1] The loss of Hylas on the Argonautic expedition, and the raging search of Heracles, form another like episode (xiii.). From these we acquire a clear notion of the kind of poem which Callimachus and his school set up as the modern model, against the long and pretentious epics of Apollonius and Rhianus.

If this, then, was the Alexandrian treatment of the epic style, we wish we could form some similar notion of what they did in tragedy. For they tell us of a Pleiad of splendid poets, fit successors of the great ancients, who came together to compose and produce plays at Alexandria.[2] The tragedies of these people are absolutely gone; we only hear a word or two of their satyric dramas, in which we know they ridiculed strict philosophers, such as Cleanthes and Menedemos; also a fragment from Dositheos's *Daphnis* has survived, and the use of recent historical subjects is

[1] Cf. my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* i. 135.

[2] Their names were Alexander the Aetolian, Philiskos of Corcyra, Dositheos of Alexandria in Troas, Homer of Caria, Aeantides (all but his name unknown), Sosiphanes of Syracuse, and lastly Lycophron of Chalcis, of whom more presently. Not one of these men was Alexandrian by birth, probably owing to its recent settlement and its non-literary population; they were not even Cyreneans like Callimachus. Nothing shows more clearly the great mixture of all kinds of Greeks found at Alexandria.

shown by the *Casandreans* of Lycophron, above mentioned.[1] It seems to me that the Alexandrian tragedy as well as comedy was a much closer copy of the older schools than the literature we have been reviewing, and that for this very reason it presented no interest to succeeding critics. Whatever merit might be attained by an original development or fusion or modification of older kinds of poetry, a direct imitation of Sophocles or Euripides was sure to turn out a failure. The ridicule of living persons in a *satyric* play shows that they had adopted features from the earlier comedy of Athens, especially the so-called Middle Comedy, but more than this our scanty information forbids us even to conjecture.

We return now to Theocritus, whom we have already met in so many departments, to consider his greatest and most successful work, the pastoral idylls or bucolics, which have fascinated the world. This and the romantic novel are in literature the permanent bequests of that many-sided, over-active, and therefore unsuccessful age. Its literary men attempted everything; in many things they apparently succeeded, but success of this kind often means ultimate failure. So the men who have been brilliant in many walks of life 'in their lifetime get their good things,' and are forgotten when the man who did one thing is praised and remembered.

There was no more thorough child of his age than Theocritus. He essayed every form of poetry then in fashion—short epics, elegiacs, hymns, encomia, epigrams, lyric poems in Aeolic metres—but, like all his contemporaries, he mixed styles and kinds of poetry, and is at the same time epic, dramatic, and lyric, without any distinction of form, writing usually in hexameters, and either in a literary Doric or Ionic dialect. He stood on Callimachus's side

[1] p. 170.

against long epics, and ridicules those who try to rival the peerless Homer. We have already spoken of his short essays in epic story, which are indeed very good work, but which do not raise him above Callimachus. The same may be said of his official praises of Hiero and of Ptolemy Philadelphus, while his hymns—a mere modification of epic—though perhaps better, are not transcendent in their merit. We may safely assert that Theocritus would now lie on the same forgotten shelf as Callimachus, Aratus, and Lycophron, were it not for his pastoral poems and dramatic sketches, which are little more than half the collection. Here the poet found his real vein, and enriched literature with a new idea —the alternate strains, or the monodies, of shepherds tending their flocks, and in their *otia dia* reflecting with the greatest simplicity the transports, the regrets, the agonies of love.

There is very little character-painting in these monodies or alternate strains, except so far as some of the shepherds or goatherds are coarser than others. The mythical shepherds, Daphnis and Menalcas, are indeed above the ordinary level, and purify the passion of love into an emotion, but all represent ordinary and often common human nature put into the circumstances of country life, and in complete sympathy with the ordinary sights and sounds of nature. It is not the vast aspects, the large views, the splendour of mountain and sea, that delight or raise them, but the humming of the bee, the sound of falling water, the leafy shade of trees while the grasshopper revels in the sun. The whole environment comes out spontaneously in the talk of the characters, who seem to express their life as naturally as possible.

And yet when we examine the work more closely we find it highly artificial, but of that supreme art which perfectly simulates nature. Theocritus was not a world-worn man

who fled from the city and the court to live with simple men and forget his griefs in their innocent pursuits. He was all his life a court poet, seeking the favour and the pay of kings, joining in literary society, eminent among the *savants* of the Museum. But he discovered a new taste wherewith to stimulate the jaded literary appetite of the professors among the sandhills; he had sufficient genius to avoid the excessive learning, the overloading details, the artificial vocabulary of his rivals, and he did it by taking refuge in a sphere where such things were of necessity excluded. He used all the devices of his school—enumerations of names, descriptions, exquisite metaphors—but he used them all with reserve and judgment. Thus his pastoral poems, for which we know no literary model, were justly hailed as a new departure in literature, and their delicate conceits, their artificial fancies, their studied simplicity, became the model first of the Romans, then of the Renaissance, then of Romanticism. Theocritus even led the fashion of disguising his literary friends under peasant names and shepherds' dress, and so we have from him no real information about Hellenistic ways and manners, though much as to Hellenistic literary taste. His pictures of pastoral life, so far as they were really taken from nature, were not Hellenistic, but universal to that kind of life; and there is no traveller who now wanders through Calabria, or Sicily, or the Cyclades, who does not witness Theocritean scenes as an everyday occurrence. Indeed, there are large tracts of Arcadia and Argolis, of Laconia and Messenia, of Phocis and Boeotia, which were once peopled with cultivated cities, but which have now gone back into the pastoral stage, and are again the domain of the goatherds and neatherds of Theocritus, resounding with the same laughter and the same complaints. But this admirable portraiture of the universal features of southern peasant-life has hidden from

us what in this book we are striving to find, a picture of the particular ways and manners which distinguished the poet's age from other times. Concerning this he tells us no more than the most mythological and artificial of the Alexandrian poets. His encomium of Ptolemy is no better than those in the hymns of Callimachus, and very like them. It has the usual courtly exaggerations, the identifying of Ptolemy, his wife, and his parents, with the gods, the praise of his wealth, of the extent of his empire, and of his patronage of literature. As usual, there is a remarkable absence of *goodness* in his portrait of the king.

But there remains one exception to all this: the *Adoniazusae*, or dramatic picture of a high feast-day at Alexandria, in which the first scene is the arrival of an Alexandrian woman in a friend's house in order that both women may go together and hear the celebrated *prima donna* sing the Adonis-song. The household details, the toilet, the complaints of the two cronies about their husbands, the admiration of a new dress and its cost, the rough treatment of an awkward servant; then the crowd in the streets, the terror of the passing cavalry, the squeeze at the entrance, the saucy rejoinder to a stranger who protests against their incessant jabber—these and many other comic and picturesque details have made this poem the best known among the so-called idylls. It may, perhaps, have been taken directly from a mime of Sophron. But here again the features are quite universal; and this very universality makes the poem great in literature. Moreover, the poet has no further interest, no ulterior motive, than the faithfulness of his picture. He is not a satirist who cloaks his contempt for a rotten civilisation under the guise of admiration for rural simplicity. He is not a moral teacher who seeks to convey lessons of life in a dramatic form. He is not a pessimist

out of humour with his surroundings. Theocritus probably thought, as Callimachus did, that the age was the most brilliant and perfect the world had yet seen. It was, indeed, a late age, when many types and forms of literature were exhausted, and when originality was difficult owing to the great roll of poets who had gone before and essayed all the paths of song. But this only enhanced the glory of a new victory and the praise of new invention. Of all the men who claimed to have attained this lofty position, and whose claim was recognised by a critical and fastidious generation, Theocritus alone has stood the test of centuries. In Roman days Philetas, Callimachus, Aratus, were more celebrated and found wider acceptance. Now they have either been lost through want of readers, or might as well have been lost, so far as the great majority of readers is concerned.

Among the new treasures which must now be taken into account is, however, a book which has many analogies to the masterpiece of Theocritus, I mean the *Mimiambics* of Herondas found recently in Egypt, and now accessible in many editions. The metre is *choliambic*, and accordingly points to a homely and realistic character in the poet's treatment of his subject, not that to us this variation sounds any meaner or more limping than other iambic metres, though it is the fashion among the Germans to say so. What makes Herondas much more peculiar and difficult is his strange vocabulary, and still more his mannerism of stuffing his dialogue full of proverbs, which have only been fathomed and explained by much learning and labour.[1] The poet seems to have written at Cos, and in the reign of the second Ptolemy, though neither conclusion is quite certain, and he professes to describe the everyday life of

[1] In this task O. Crusius, who had made Greek proverbs his specialty, has done as much for us as all the rest of the Commentators.

such women as those in the *Adoniazusae* of his great contemporary. But the coarseness and vulgarity of this life makes me at once repudiate the notion that the author was describing actual life at Cos. This island was noted for its refinement and good manners, and some of the subjects which Herondas treats are not fit for any decent society. The longer I consider these curious sketches, and their close relation to that of Theocritus, which, we are told, was derived from the Syracusan Sophron, the more I am persuaded that we have before us a mere adaptation in verse of some of the 'Female Mimes' of that celebrated master. Even Plato is said to have made him a constant study. But then Sophron was describing the Doric life of Syracuse at a far earlier epoch, and we have no reason to think that in the greater refinement of the Hellenistic age such vulgar manners could have been at all common at Cos.

These Mimiambics, therefore, though a curious and valuable contribution to our knowledge of Greek, and of Greek proverbs, are not in my opinion of any value as a direct study of Hellenistic life. They are but another specimen of the fashion of that age to revive and rehandle the work of older masters, with closer attention to form, generally with a corresponding loss of spirit. It may also be added that Herondas gives us nothing but town-life and town-manners, which never can have such attraction for us as the manners and morals of a pastoral population, living in the open air and in the midst of natural beauty. Theocritus, indeed, has given us two idylls, and those perhaps the greatest (ii. and xv.), concerning city life. But the main body of his work breathes the scent of thyme and the fresh air of mountain and grassy plain. These *otia dia* make a background very different from the cobbler's shop, the back street with its low gossip, the mental, if

not the material squalor of a shabby life with none but the lowest objects in view.

I pass for a moment to the last remaining poem of this prolific age, the strange and weird *Alexandra* (or *Cassandra*) of Lycophron. If Theocritus sought to represent ordinary life and language as closely as true art would permit, and succeeded by means of his admirable realism, surely Lycophron sought the very opposite way to fame, and strove to outdo his pedantic and artificial age by such a display of obscure myths clothed in obscure language as make his work a riddle, and its explanation the arena of the scholiast. He seems to have sought his extraordinary vocabulary, as Mr. Bury tells me, in the out-of-the-way tragic diction, such as that of Sophocles, which abounded in odd *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, now preserved only in the Lexica.[1] The plot or plan of this production, which can hardly be called literature, is that a servant, sent to watch Cassandra—who in some obscure legends was called Alexandra[2]—by her father Priam, gives an account, in 1440 iambic trimeters, of the prophecies of the princess, which reach through the Trojan war and other early legends, with a notice of the first victories of the Romans. Indeed, the verses 1226-1280 and 1446-1450 make it possible that the poet is, after all, a later Lycophron, writing after the final defeat of Philip V. of Macedon. If not, these passages are interpolated. But indeed it makes very little difference. The learned jargon in which the verses are composed is such that no Greek scholar, however accomplished, can read five lines without being puzzled; and, but for the paraphrases and full scholia

[1] I have elsewhere commented on this feature in Sophocles, *Hist. of Greek Lit.* i. 314.

[2] This is mentioned by Pausanias iii. 19, 6; 26, 5; who says she was so called in two places in Laconia, and worshipped at a shrine.

extant in the Marcian MS., we might close the book at once as a hopeless riddle. If then the book be indeed by the Lycophron who wrote admired tragedies under Philadelphus, and drew the picture of the tyrant Apollodorus already mentioned (p. 170), we have a second instance, like that of Casander's pedant brother, how far the search after recondite learning could carry a sensible man in that artificial age, which was striving so hard and so unsuccessfully after literary originality.[1]

We may now proceed to estimate the effect of Hellenism upon literature at Alexandria in the second generation of that city, and under the fostering care of Philadelphus. The reader may possibly have been surprised at the quantity of poetry that is extant. I have only cited a few fragments, but if we were to sum up all these and the epigrams which belong to this generation, there appears a body of literature quite large enough to distinguish any age, and one which certainly had more influence on Roman literature than all that went before. Even when a poet like Virgil reproduces Homer and Hesiod, we feel that he has approached them not directly but through the Alexandrian poets, through Aratus and Apollonius. It is their admiration, their treatment, which breathes through his work. These writers, therefore, influenced posterity materially; they even laid down the form of certain distinct branches of literary art which have lasted to the present day.[2]

[1] We can now study this curious author in a good text with German translation and notes by Professor C. von Holzinger of Prague. An old English translation by Lord Royston shows that even in England the poet once excited considerable interest.

[2] Their refinements and restrictions in writing hexameter and elegiac metres have been explained in my *Greek World under Roman Sway* pp. 375 *sq.*

But when we turn to consider what effect this great outburst of book-writing had upon the culture of the day, on the education of the people, on the fusing of nations into the large unity of Hellenistic civilisation, the answer is very unsatisfactory. All these learned men were attracted by Ptolemy to Egypt, a country with an old and splendid culture, with magnificent monuments, with an established clergy holding the traditions of an ancient history and literature. They stood face to face with what Pythagoras and Plato and Herodotus had admired as the fountainhead of the world's philosophy and the world's religion. Now was the time, if they indeed loved research, to have all these things translated, interpreted, and made Hellenistic property. A beginning had been made, possibly under Ptolemy Soter, by Manetho's Greek account of the Egyptian dynasties, and hence we might fairly have expected other translations to follow, like the LXX. version of the Jewish books. But alas! this good beginning bore no fruit. In all the books we have reviewed there is hardly a mention of Egypt, and then merely as a rich possession of Ptolemy, giving him power and glory among Hellenistic sovrans. Apollonius once alludes to the conquests of Sesostris, as a sort of prototype for the conquests of Ptolemy. Theocritus speaks of the 33,333 cities of Egypt under his sway. The scientific men seem to have collected the curious fauna and flora of this sub-tropical climate.[1] But Aratus, though hardly a stranger to Alexandria, does not even describe the constellations of the Egyptian heavens, much less give us any account of the remarkable observations and calendar of the Egyptian priests. These men all seem dead to any notion of fusing Greek and Egyptian culture, or explaining the old mythical history of Greece and Asia Minor by any records from the hieroglyphics.

[1] Cf. above, p. 209.

I look upon this melancholy and stupid neglect as mainly the fault of the second Ptolemy. His father brought him up very carefully in Greek culture, as a Macedonian soldier, the companion of Alexander, was sure to do. He sought for him the best Greek teachers, and we know that he was acting under the advice of an Attic philosopher when he founded his university. It was these people, with their overweening national pride and their contempt of all else as barbarian, who so warped the young king's mind that he sought to make Alexandria a Greek capital, with Egypt behind it as a mere source of revenue. The Egyptians, as we have already seen, were declared, with curious short-sightedness, politically inferior to the Graeco-Macedonian invaders.[1] The whole attention of poets, of historians, of politicians, was directed not to Egypt but to Greece and the Levant. The Dons of the Museum spent their time in raking up the myths and mythologies of obscure villages in Arcadia, the local cults of Attica or the Troad, in fact all the idle and defunct trivialities of Greek legendary lore, instead of drawing from the great stream which brought to their gates the wisdom and the learning of countless generations of culture. We hear of rich offerings and temples dedicated by Philadelphus at Olympia, at Samothrace, at Cos, at Rhodes, but there are few remains[2] among the

[1] I can hardly believe that the administrator of Egyptian affairs, according to Egyptian law, was openly styled *πράκτωρ τῶν ξενικῶν*, the 'foreign agent' for the Ptolemaic government—a bitter insult, as well as the symbol of a stupid and ignorant policy, and yet even this has been asserted by some. We still have the formal genealogy of the Ptolemies from Heracles and Dionysus from Satyrus (Müller *FHG* iii. p. 165), and also in the inscription of Adule. By way of rivalry the Syrian Seleucus claimed descent from Apollo. Cf. Dittenberger *Sylloge* i. 240.

[2] He built a fine granite temple in the Delta, and began the great temple at Philae; also at Pithom and Mendes he endowed the priests.

splendid monuments of the Ptolemies in Egypt which show any living interest taken by the king in the people that supplied him with his wealth. He posed as the most Hellenic of kings in the most non-Hellenic of countries. The literature he patronised was that of a remote country, and even there of bygone generations. It had no living contact with the Greeks, far less with the Egyptians. Thus his reign seems to me to have been a deliberate reversal of the Greek lessons taught by Alexander, and a return to the stupid advice of Aristotle to treat the Greeks (and Macedonians)—ἡγεμονικῶς—as a leader, the 'barbarians'—δεσποτικῶς—as a master.

We know that the reaction came. When we look to the monuments of the next king, Euergetes, we find the inscription of Canopus reverting to the policy of Soter implied in the document above cited (p. 189), and giving privileges and benefits to the national religion. But the protocol is no longer in hieroglyphics alone, but in hieroglyphics, in demotic, and in Greek. We find, moreover, many great temples built by him throughout Egypt to Egyptian gods, and so thoroughly Egyptian in style that till the inscriptions were read it required all the genius of Letronne to sustain the very improbable thesis that Hellenistic Ptolemies should have built purely Egyptian architecture.[1] Yet such proved to be the case. Egypt is now covered with these remains. Not only at Karnak, beside the older and more splendid work, but upon old sites, such as Esneh, Edfu,

But these acts show no trace in his general policy or in his tastes. He seems not even to have had a native mistress.

[1] We find in Cyprus an ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κατὰ Κύπρον appointed by the Ptolemies, who presided over the cult of the gods Euergetae, along with that of Dionysus, Demeter, and other gods. This style, borrowed from Egypt, was probably the model of Augustus afterwards. Cf. *BCH* xi. 251.

and Denderah, the Egyptian reaction shows itself complete, and the Ptolemies figure with *Pshent* and *Uraeus*, with winged disk and crook of life, with cartouched name and pictured titles, the literal descendants of the ancient Pharaohs.

All this perfectly natural and necessary reaction was probably delayed by Philadelphus, who severed completely Greek and Egyptian culture, made no attempt to draw Egyptians into his Museum, and allowed them to develop that hatred for Greek manners and religion which prohibited any wholesome fusion of ideas, and resulted in a series of dangerous revolutions among the people. The priestly caste kept all its knowledge sullenly to itself, and that knowledge dried up more and more into rigid formalism. The pedants of the Museum confined themselves to Greek learning and Greek interests, and so stood apart, a learned caste, with no national feeling to support them.

Thus, so far as I can see, the first great attempt at the fusion of races, the first essay in Hellenism, was a failure, so far as the policy of the leading personage of the day could affect it.

The laborious investigations of Droysen into the Hellenistic colonies of this century lead to a similar result. While the Seleucids founded some forty cities in Upper Syria between Antioch and the Tigris, so that the whole country became interpenetrated with Hellenistic polities, using the Greek tongue and endowed with the largest communal independence, we find the new cities of the Lagidae as a rule beyond the bounds of Egypt, and rather outposts of influence in foreign lands than centres for the propaganda of Hellenism. Thus a town called Arsinoe was founded in Crete, another, indeed several towns, in Cilicia and Pamphylia, as well as a series of sea-coast settlements down the

Red Sea, but in Egypt itself only two, Ptolemais[1] in Upper Egypt, near Thebes, and Crocodilopolis, which was the capital of the Arsinoite nome (Fayyum), but so far as we can see not a *Greek city*. We hear that in other Egyptian towns the Greeks lived in their separate quarters, and under separate privileges. The outposts on the Red Sea as far as Adule, and perhaps as Aden, were intended for elephant hunting, and to protect the ship traffic from India in that dangerous sea, full of shoals and currents, and infested with pirates; nor do we hear that any of these settlements, which are mostly attributed to Philadelphus, were meant to civilise the people, or to bring them into a more settled method of life.

I cannot indeed but feel, from the evidence which has been recovered since I first wrote this chapter,[2] that the Hellenistic side of the second Ptolemy may have not been so exclusive as we imagine, and that he made some concessions to national feeling. But I do not think his isolated benevolences, which were counterbalanced by invasions of the tithes of the temples, point to any real sympathy for old Egyptian culture, or for the great patrimony bequeathed by old Egyptian learning.

As if to show us what Hellenistic art could do, in a period which many scholars consider an age of decadence, we have a new surprise—there have been many in this history—in the discovery of the famous tombs at Sidon, of which there is now a whole series in the Museum of Con-

[1] This Ptolemais was, as Strabo says, a thoroughly Greek town, to judge from the establishment there of a society of dramatic artists, such as were common in Greece, and will be described hereafter. Cf. Miller in *BCH* ix. 2, 132. But excavations on this site are only commencing.

[2] We have now a new inscription, the Pithom stone, first interpreted by Naville in his book on *Pithom*, then recently by Kohler, Berlin *Sitzber.* for 1895.

stantinople. I shall only here advert to the principal group, found in the same tomb, of which the lesser two sarcophagi, probably those of a princess and her child, are very simple white marble imitations of a closed cella, with borders and decorations round the eaves in the purest Greek design and of very graceful execution. Had these been found alone, they would surely have been referred to the golden age of Hellenedom. But with them was the sarcophagus of a king, of which all the four sides and the gables are covered with wonderful reliefs, exquisitely coloured, representing scenes of chase, and war, and apparently of murder, whose character at once gives us a major limit for their age. In these compositions, Persians, Macedonians, and Greeks appear in conflict, all unmistakeable from their dress. It is even likely that one of the figures in the lion-hunt, with a fillet (diadem) round his head, is Alexander himself. But in this very scene a Persian grandee is before him, and there is another scene, a leopard-hunt, in which none but Persians are engaged. Putting aside the first foolish hypothesis, that it was the tomb of Alexander himself, which is in contradiction to the whole history of his sepulture, the likely hypothesis is that a king of Sidon, who joined the great king, and took part in his wars, obtained for himself from Greece this splendid monument, and was laid with his family in this necropolis in which many other Sidonian kings had been buried. We hear that Alexander gave Hephaestion leave to nominate a king, and there was one called Philocles, who was an active ally of Ptolemy Soter in his wars. Two things only are quite certain. The tomb was adorned with reliefs after Alexander's invasion. The perfection of its work is such that we could only name the Parthenon friezes as superior. The grace and beauty of the figures, both naked and clothed, is such as puts all

modern work to shame, nor can we conceive the artists to have been Sidonians, but Greeks who either did the work at some art-centre, such as Athens or Sicyon, or else were imported from their homes to Sidon, and there showed the astonished natives what their conquerors had brought them with their arms.[1]

This sarcophagus, together with the Nike of Samothrace, set up by Demetrius,[2] shows what we might expect in the Alexandria of Ptolemy, were it not hidden deep under the modern city, partly even under the sea. When such work passes unnoticed in its age, and has left no record in the art-history of the time, we may well assume that there is little real decadence affecting the taste of the age.

[1] Cf. Hamdi Bey's *Une Nécropole royale de Sidon*, with autotype plates, Paris, 1892-94.

[2] Fully described in Conze's *Samothrak*, and in the fourth part of Overbeck's *Griechische Plastik*.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CITY LIFE OF THE THIRD CENTURY B.C., AND ITS EFFECTS UPON THE CIVILISATION OF THE AGE

As regards Alexandria and its ways, we only know from all the books we have quoted that its great population was distinguished into very separate societies. At the head of all was a luxurious and dissolute court, whose deified head allowed himself amours even with courtesans, which were notorious and not censured. The royal princesses had immense power, and kept great state. I infer from the description of Iris's duties in Callimachus[1] that they had

[1] *Hymn. Del.* 217 *sq.*—Iris comes in panting to tell the news that Latona has been received in Delos, and that her children are born. 'She spake, and sat down below the golden throne, like the hound of Artemis, which, when the goddess rests from her swift hunting, sits by her feet, and its ears are ever erect, ready to catch her exciting voice (ὁμοκλήν). So did the daughter of Thaumas (Iris) sit below the throne; and she is never forgetful of her station, not even when sleep presses her with oblivious wing, but leaning her head a little against the corner of the great throne she sleeps in a leaning posture; and never does she loose her girdle, or her swift running shoes, lest her mistress should give her a sudden order.' I do not think any earlier Greek poet would have drawn such a picture. If it describes, as I feel sure, Arsinoe's household, the social position of these maids of honour would be very interesting. Were they in the condition of slaves, or were they female relatives of the king's Peers? Considering the old Macedonian fashion of the *royal pages*, drawn from the nobility, I prefer the second alternative.

maids of honour in attendance night and day to carry out instantly their behests. They often went out in state, when we may be sure the populace was compelled to stand very respectfully out of the way, and keep silence even from good words. On the other hand, court poets like Callimachus were allowed to speak with strange license of the most intimate relations in the royal household; and indeed all through Alexandrian society great freedom of manners prevailed. Women of the lower classes commonly went to shows and festivals, and spoke without reserve to men in the crowd.[1] They all spoke Greek, though still of various dialects, seeing that there were recent settlers from all Hellenedom in various quarters of the town.[2] The second idyll of Theocritus even represents to us a young unmarried woman living alone with her maid in her own house and going out to see processions, where she falls in love with a handsome stranger. The streets, indeed, were full of women and children, in wide contrast to the habits of Hellenic towns.

There was also a large and wealthy mercantile society, with relations reaching from Italy to India, of which we know no details. The 'Macedonians,' or soldier population, we shall meet again. How far the Jews belonged to the merchants, and how far they were yet another class apart, it is now impossible to say. There remains to be enumerated the highest intellectual society, the people of the Museum,

[1] Cf. Theocritus's *Adoniazusae*, as a picture of Alexandrian manners. We can now quote in support the 4th of Herondas's *Mimiambics*, where two women go out to see the treasures of a temple in a similar way. Even if both are borrowed from Sophron, I presume they do not conflict with the ordinary manners of the day.

[2] We know from an inscription found at Pergamum (No. 5 of the texts edited at Berlin) that at Temnos, close beside that capital, the Aeolic dialect was still used in public documents in the earlier part of the third century B.C.

who counted as a sort of appendage to the court; and the mass of artisans and day-labourers, whom we may presume to have been Egyptians. These last, admitted to no rank or emolument, were nevertheless powerful by their numbers; they and the Jews swelled the mob of Alexandria; and we know that this mob had gloomy and cruel fits, which made the politer cities of the world look upon it with dislike or disgust.

Let us try to gather some facts about other towns at the same period. We may divide the enormous number of Greek-speaking towns through Europe and Asia into various distinctly-marked classes. There were, of course, the ancient Hellenic cities in Magna Graecia, Sicily, Greece, and Asia Minor, which, in addition to their old and recognised features, had a new point in common, that they were almost all rapidly decaying. This was particularly the case with the second-rate towns which were not art-centres or political centres, such as Argos, the restored Thebes, all the Italiot and Sicilian towns except Syracuse, and even some of the famous cities of Asia Minor. The depopulation of Greek countries, which was now rapidly setting in, affected such cities in the first instance, so that the towns of Boeotia, the towns of Elis, and other well-known and historic sites of population and of culture, sank down in many instances to be mere villages.[1] The fighting men were no longer able to man the large circuit of the walls, and grass began to grow in the wide thoroughfares. Such was pre-eminently the case with the ostentatious foundations of Epaminondas, Messene, and even Megalopolis, in spite of the vigour and brilliancy of its career in this century.

[1] We can now quote the interesting case of the amalgamation of Medeon and Stiris in Phocis, of which the details have been recovered from an inscription. Cf. Beaudouin *BCH* v. 43 *sq.*

Nevertheless it would be distinctly false to say that city life, as a whole, was decaying in the golden age of Hellenism. The very reverse is the case. But with a few exceptions the centre of gravity shifted in each district from the old to the new foundations, and men were prouder or better off as citizens of an Arsinoe or Lysimacheia or Casandreia or Berenike than of Thespiae or Pagasae or Halicarnassus.

But let us consider the exceptions—the ancient cities which still maintained their importance and their population.

Athens, of course, stands first. Her historic fame brought her not only material support from various kings, but the far greater advantage of being the recognised centre of philosophy in the world, towards which outlying thinkers gravitated. The New Comedy, with its shallow spirit, was passing out of fashion, and the serious life of the philosophic schools taking its place. Young men from many quarters of the Greek world came together there, and so political theorists were being trained at Athens who went forth to upset or restore the constitutions of their homes, to set up as tyrants or their destroyers, to break or to frame legal codes upon new principles. By a sort of tacit consent among the rulers of the world Athens was allowed to proclaim its independence a few years after the Chremonidean war (about 250 B.C.), and the sentiment of the Hellenistic world was strong enough to protect this independence against the cupidity or ambition of powerful neighbours. To violate the territory of Athens became a sort of sacrilege, which set all respectable Hellenistic opinion against the invader, and in a polite and cultivated age, where sentiment counted for a great deal, this was a bulwark far stronger than ships and fortifications.

Here, then, was developed that critical idleness, that

serious trifling, that earnest playing with great ideas, which is wont to gather round the real thinking of every great intellectual centre. The Athens of St. Paul, and even of Libanius, was practically the Athens reconstituted by the intellectual and moral forces now at work.

If we turn to the other focus of older Hellenedom, Sparta, we find a very different and a very curious picture. If Athens saved herself and prolonged her influence by a bold reformation in her intellectual life, by conforming to the new age in her literary tastes, and maintaining in sentiment what she lost in power, Sparta, still retaining firm hold of the respect of Greece, allowed all the modern corruption and decay to invade her under the guise of strict conservatism. While the forms of the Lycurgean constitution—the two kings, the yearly ephors, the council of elders —were yet alive, the old frugality and modesty had given way to great luxury and social injustice. Since the law of the ephor Epitadeus, the complete liberty of bequeathing property by will had resulted, curiously enough, in entail by primogeniture becoming the ordinary practice. In many cases women too inherited, and these, being always outside the discipline of Lycurgus, became people of influence in society and politics. The consequence was that younger sons either went abroad as mercenaries, where they knocked about in satraps' courts and danced attendance upon foreign kings, or sat down in poverty and idleness at home. It is hard to say which course of life was more likely to upset the constitution. The returning mercenary brought with him the manners and customs of modern Hellenism, and looked with contempt upon everything Spartan save the luxury of the wealthy nobles, whom he instructed in new ideas of extravagance. The malcontent at home looked on the world as awry and its goods as unfairly divided, and was

ready for any revolution which should oust the small remaining oligarchy of proprietors.[1]

Thus between those who dreaded any reform and those who were ready for any revolution there was a great gulf fixed. Even the external appearance of Sparta was no longer that of her palmy days. Instead of open villages grouped together, she was now a walled town, with handsome temples and a theatre; she had many foreigners resident, especially mercenary soldiers, and had her highest citizens perpetually coming home from foreign service with Asiatic gold and Asiatic manners. Even the kings condescended to this service, and one of them, strangely misnamed Leonidas, had so polluted the sacred blood of Heracles as to marry an Asiatic wife, and beget foreign children—a capital offence according to the old laws.

In Plutarch's *Life of Agis*, from which I take these details, we have a curious account of the attempt at a peaceful revolution by the young king, who thought to abolish debts and redistribute lands without having recourse to any expedient stronger than legal violence. He gives his own fortune to the state, a fortune, besides farms and pasture, amounting in ready money to 600 talents (nearly £150,000), but we are told that the poorest satraps in the East had far larger treasure. His plan was baulked by the people of property, who were naturally backed by the elders and ephors; in fact it was a conflict of the old and rich, who held all the magistracies and privileges, against the young and poor, far greater in numbers but with no practical leaders save the enthusiast and the dishonest. Agis failed; he could not 'turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, the disobedient to the wisdom of the just'; and he was put to death with his noble mother and her friends, who had

[1] 700 only in the days of Agis III.

been converted by his theories, and now shared his fate. The historians of the day tell us many anecdotes of the splendid disinterestedness of these ladies, and however embellished such stories may be, if their sentimentality, sometimes a little mawkish, be discounted, they show clearly what was the ideal of the age. Here is a specimen :—

Chelonis, the daughter of Leonidas, had looked upon the injury done her father as done to herself: when [her husband] Cleombrotus robbed him of the crown, she left him, to console her father in his misfortune. While he was in the sanctuary, she stayed with him, and when he retired she attended him in his flight, sympathising with his sorrow, and full of resentment against Cleombrotus. But when the fortunes of her father changed, she changed too. She joined her husband as a suppliant, and was found sitting by him with great marks of tenderness ; and her two children, one on each side, at her feet. The whole company were much struck at the sight, and they could not refrain from tears when they considered her goodness of heart and such superior instances of affection.

Chelonis then pointing to her mourning habit and dishevelled hair, thus addressed Leonidas. 'It was not, my dear father, compassion for Cleombrotus which put me in this habit and gave me this look of misery. My sorrows took their date with your misfortunes and your banishment, and have ever since remained my familiar companions. Now you have conquered your enemies, and are again king of Sparta, should I still retain these ensigns of affliction, or assume festival and royal ornaments while the husband of my youth, whom you gave me, falls a victim to your vengeance? If his own submission, if the tears of his wife and children, cannot propitiate you, he must suffer a severer punishment for his offences than you require :—he must see his beloved wife die before him, for how can I live and support the sight of my own sex, after both my husband and my father have refused to hearken to my supplication—when it appears that, both as a wife and a daughter, I am born to be miserable with my family? If this poor man had any plausible reasons for what he did, I obviated them all by forsaking him to follow you. But you

furnish him with a sufficient apology for his misbehaviour, by showing that the crown is so great and desirable an object, that a son-in-law must be slain, and a daughter utterly disregarded, where that is in the question.'

Chelonis, after this supplication, rested her cheek on her husband's head, and with an eye dim and languid with sorrow looked round on the spectators. Leonidas consulted his friends upon the point, and then commanded Cleombrotus to rise and go into exile; but he desired Chelonis to stay, and not leave so affectionate a father, who had been kind enough to grant her her husband's life. Chelonis, however, would not be persuaded. When her husband was risen from the ground, she put one child in his arms, and took the other herself, and after having paid due homage at the altar where they had taken sanctuary, she went with him into banishment. So that, had not Cleombrotus been corrupted with the love of false glory, he must have thought exile, with such a woman, a greater happiness than a kingdom without her.[1]

We hear also that all the party of the rich through Peloponnesus, especially in Achaea and Arcadia, were in dread of the revolution proposed by Agis, as it would directly affect each city, so that the inequality of wealth and consequent prominence of discontented pauperism were not found in Sparta only. Still, with all these faults, Sparta produced not only noble men and women, but was socially above all the Hellenistic world. The kings of Sparta were venerated, while the kings of Egypt and Macedon were flattered with vile adulation, and to be a Spartan noble was even still, perhaps, a more distinguished rank than to be one of the Macedonian peers.[2]

We wish Plutarch, in speaking of the wealth and the

[1] Plutarch's *Agis* c. xvii.

[2] Thus Plutarch (*Aratus* 38) cites the ordinary opinion when he says: *εἰ δὲ Κλεομένης ἦν παράνομος καὶ τυραννικός, ἀλλ' Ἡρακλεῖδαι πατέρες αὐτῷ καὶ Σπάρτη πατρίς, ἧς τὸν ἀφανέστατον ἄξιον ἀντὶ τοῦ πρώτου Μακεδόνων ἡγεμόνα ποιεῖσθαι*, κτλ.

luxury of noble Spartan ladies, had told us in what that splendour consisted. Sparta was not now an art-centre, and what we have found lately[1] upon its site is work of archaic refinement far older than the present period. Yet we may infer that, however illiterate these nobles were, their taste cannot have been vulgar or gaudy. Their traditions were splendid, and the antique simplicity of Lycurgean habits must have chastened their taste. Those who went abroad, though often rude, sensual, and unprincipled, were never reprehended, so far as I know, for the vices of the upstart. This very conservative type must therefore have had no small influence in repressing the tawdry tendencies of the age. Just as the English nobility, however ignorant many of them are, have a certain style which is a model to all fashionable people over the world, and prevents the Italian or German or other inferior types being adopted as the standard; so, I take it, the Spartans, with all their dulness, their ignorance, their backwardness, did the same good service in an age full of vulgar ostentation, sudden wealth, and unreal refinement. The Asiatic or the Macedonian, who affected Hellenism with all his might, could attain perhaps the learning of the Museum, the tenets of the Porch or the Garden, the wit of Attica; he might even master the use of the particles, which Aristotle thought so crucial a test, but the style of the Spartan aristocrat was beyond him. It was not the new Hellenism, but the old and pure Hellenedom.

Let us now turn to the western capitals of Hellenic life, Tarentum and Syracuse. Both still maintained their primacy,

[1] Cf. my *Rambles and Studies in Greece* 3rd ed. p. 382. These carved reliefs have been reproduced in the *Mittheilungen* of the German Institute at Athens (ii. and viii.), and again in Duruy's illustrated *Hist. of Greece* i. 298, 320.

the one in Sicily, the other in Magna Graecia, nor could any other Italiot settlements vie with them. Their whilome rivals, Sybaris, Crotona, Agrigentum, were either destroyed or totally insignificant. The war of Rome with Pyrrhus had implicated Tarentum,[1] which had lost its political power, but was still a populous and wealthy place, and still under that most licentious of democracies, a Doric democracy.[2] The produce and the cookery of Tarentum were still famous throughout the world, but the city was distinctly a decaying Hellenic, not a Hellenistic capital.[3]

Very nearly the same may be said of Syracuse, which was not a democracy, but falling under the able and unscrupulous tyranny of Agathocles, and then under the prudent and paternal despotism of Hiero, still maintained a high position even in culture. Agathocles was variously connected with the Hellenistic sovrans, and took his place among them as the Emperor Napoleon III. took his place among the sovrans of Europe. Thus Syracuse ranked with the new capitals as well as with the old; men of letters went there; they frequented the court of Hiero and sang his praises; they studied literature and science there, and perhaps no Hellenic city more thoroughly maintained its place under the new order of things. The people were

[1] He was the fifth mercenary prince whom they imported to help them, as Strabo tells us.

[2] I cannot fix the date of the outrage on the women and children of the Iapygian town Karbina which Clearchus reports (Athenaeus xii. 522 d), and of which he cites the evidence as consisting in certain stelae standing in front of Tarentine houses, where the ancestors who had taken part in the outrage were deprived of their memorial honours, and the Zeus of lightning appeased instead. But the whole catalogue *περὶ τρυφῆς* of Athenaeus is to me suspicious.

[3] Nevertheless it was adorned with *colossi* of the Hellenistic type, one of which, the work of Lysippus, was carried to Rome, Strabo vi. 3, § 2. This shows that they went in some points with the time.

moreover aristocrats in the true Hellenic sense, Dorians derived from Corinth in almost mythic times, Dorians still in speech and proud of their dialect.[1]

Syracuse took no mean part in shaping the current of Hellenistic literature, and contributed the freshest and most original elements to Alexandrian poetry. The shepherds, the lovers, the townspeople of Theocritus are only settlers in Alexandria; their true home is in Syracuse and its surrounding pastures, or else in the mimes of Sophron.[2] But I suppose that the Syracusan type was essentially that of a wealthy burgher or very outspoken freeman. For the many tyrants since the elder Dionysius must have levelled their subjects very much, killing or exiling the nobles and men of mark, and favouring the working classes. This was the tendency of every Greek tyranny. The Syracusan was therefore the same sort of democratic aristocrat as the Athenian—the citizen of a great and famous city, with splendid monuments, great poets and philosophers, and noble records, to make him proud of his origin.

I do not know that I can cite any Asiatic cities of old renown on a par with these examples. Such cities as Smyrna, Ephesus, Colophon, Miletus, had long been reduced in influence, and we find them recreated out of surrounding villages and out of other cities and furnished with Hellenistic names, and with an importation of foreign settlers, like the Jews whom Antiochus the Great settled with civic rights in the cities of Asia Minor,—all this showing that their greatness was gone or had faded before their new

[1] Cf. Theocr. *Idyll* xv. 91-3:—

Κορίνθιαι εἰμὲς ἄνωθεν,
ὡς καὶ ὁ Βελλεροφῶν· Πελοποννασιστὶ λαλεῦμες·
Δωρίσδεν δ' ἔξεστι, δοκῶ, τοῖς Δωριέεσσι.

[2] Above, p. 299.

rivals. Perhaps the most eminent town (next to Rhodes) of Eastern Hellenedom was Byzantium, which, in spite of Celts and Thracians, who harried it almost beyond endurance, still held the key of the Bosporus, and with it a great position. But even Byzantium had to suffer from the rivalry of new foundations, such as Lysimacheia, Alexandria Troas, Pergamum, Nicomedia, and newer seaports like Heracleia on the Euxine. Nor can I cite any credible evidence[1] on the interior or social condition of Byzantium. Its politics will occupy us presently in connexion with Rhodes.

Passing from these ancient and noble cities we come to another class, also of ancient foundation, which were so rebuilt or modified as to date their after history justly from this epoch. For it was a common thing either to gather the people of several surrounding towns, or even to modify the site of an old town so as to suit modern requirements and the wishes of the new founder. Examples of either proceeding were New Smyrna, New Ilion, New Sicyon, New Thebes, and many others. The first two were in the plans of Alexander, but the actual refounding was due to Antigonus or Lysimachus, and both attained to considerable prosperity, Ilion even to a primacy over the adjoining towns. Thebes was restored by Casander with the approval and help of the Hellenic world, even including Agathocles of Syracuse. But modern Theban life affords

[1] Athenaeus (xi. 490, 491) cites Moero, a learned Byzantine lady who wrote a hexameter poem called *Mnemosyne*, with ingenious commentaries on difficulties in Homer. But whether she lived and taught at Byzantium we cannot tell. There are notes on the luxury and effeminacy of the people scattered through Athenaeus (cf. especially p. 442 on their cowardice and drunkenness), but these seem to me libellous exaggerations, for the city sustained itself through long and pressing dangers.

us nothing of interest[1] till we reach the far later days of Plutarch.

Sicyon, on the contrary, was one of the most important of these re-foundations, and a very characteristic example of the class. It had been very handsomely refounded on a higher level, that of its old acropolis, by Demetrius Poliorketes, who desired to call it Demetrias, but without success. This change of site was here possible because a higher and yet isolated plateau[2] succeeds to the shore-level (where the old town stood), with ample room for streets and walls, and with the command of a beautiful view up and down the Gulf of Corinth, and across to the mountains of Boeotia and Phocis. The older Sicyon had been a celebrated art-centre. Pausanias, in his account of the place, mentions old works of Calamis and of Scopas, as well as of Lysippus and the newer school, and after its restoration it became one of the chief schools for sculpture and painting in the world—a sort of Hellenistic Florence. In an age of art-collecting, when rich kings and satraps liked to obtain the *chefs-d'œuvre* of renowned artists, and paid large prices for them, such a reputation meant power and wealth for Sicyon, and we hear, specially in Plutarch's *Life of Aratus*, that it was by collecting and sending to Ptolemy these objects that he conciliated and maintained the king's favour. It was now,

[1] The sketch of Boeotian life, with its luxury, sloth and feasting, together with complete idleness and neglect of all public business, given by Polybius (xx. 14), is to me perfectly incredible. How could a people that lived in perpetual idleness, and also extravagance, remain rich and keep the means of luxury? Cf. *Mitth.* vii. 32, 38 on an inscription of Orchomenus, which Latischev thinks good evidence. It is only a solitary case at the end of the third century B.C. Cf. also *BCH* iv. 1 *sq.* for the text, and Foucart's commentary, and on the new Boeotian confederation of fifteen towns *BCH* xiii. 15 *sq.*, 228.

[2] A very interesting view of this site was drawn by Sir T. Wyse, and may be seen in his *Travels in the Peloponnesus*.

indeed, part of a good education to have taste in these matters, as the following extract will show :—

This taste for painting had already recommended Aratus to Ptolemy, and his conversation gained so much farther upon him that he made him a present of a hundred and fifty talents for the city; forty of which he sent with him on his return to Peloponnesus, and remitted the rest in the several portions and at the times that he had fixed. It was a glorious thing to apply so much money to the use of his fellow-citizens, at a time when it was common to see generals and demagogues, for much smaller sums which they received of the kings, oppress, enslave, and betray to them the cities where they were born. But it was still more glorious, by this money to reconcile the poor to the rich, to secure the commonwealth, and establish harmony amongst all ranks of people.

His moderation in the exercise of the great power vested in him was truly admirable. For, being appointed sole arbitrator of the claims of the exiles, he refused to act alone, and joined fifteen of the citizens in the commission; with whose assistance, after much labour and attention, he established peace and friendship amongst the people. Beside the honours which the whole community conferred on him for these services, the exiles in particular erected his statue in bronze, and put upon it this inscription :

> Far as the pillars which Alcides rear'd,
> Thy counsels and thy deeds in arms for Greece
> The tongue of Fame has told. But we, Aratus,
> We wanderers whom thou hast restored to Sicyon,
> Will sing thy justice; place thy pleasing form,
> As a benignant power with gods that save.
> For thou hast given that dear equality,
> And all the laws which favouring Heaven might give.

This culture at Sicyon was, however, not the outcome of free institutions, but flourished under a succession of tyrants, who murdered and exiled many rich citizens, and succeeded to power by the murder of their rivals. It was under these circumstances that the young Aratus was exiled, and brought

up by family friends at Argos. We are surprised to hear that, far from enduring the traditional hardships of a Greek exile, he lived in luxury and comfort, training for athletics, entertaining his friends, and in fact cloaking his designs on Sicyon by the notoriety of his somewhat dissolute amusements. At all events, life at Argos, as well as at Sicyon, must have been easy for the richer classes, and we cannot but hold that the crimes of the tyrants of both places have been grossly exaggerated, since no wholesale confiscations could have occurred in such society as that in which Aratus moved.

In fact Plutarch, the sworn enemy of tyrants, who gives us such highly-seasoned pictures of them as are found in his *Life of Dion*, is obliged to admit the high culture of Sicyon, and Strabo (viii. 383) says they were, as a rule, moderate and well-meaning men. This agrees with what we know of the temper of the world, the popularity of monarchy, and the desire of able men to impress a higher character upon the age. Such was probably the tyrant Abantidas of Sicyon, whom the conspirators of the Peripatetic school murdered while he was attending, according to his wont, the philosophical discussions in the market-place.

But of course mere ambition was also a cause of tyranny, especially when backed up by the favour and support of the kings. We feel it was a mere accident that Aratus himself was not a tyrant, instead of the destroyer of tyrants. He preferred political influence to absolute power, but when his opportunity came, towards the end of his life, no ruler was more tyrannous, or indeed cruel, than he. If, therefore, we have the type of a philosopher-tyrant, ruling his native city with an absolute hand on the principle that the majority were fools, we have also the class to which Aratus belonged,

the old Doric aristocracy of the northern Peloponnesus (Achaea, Corinth, and Argos), who still had wealth and pride, but were not of the new school, not men of intellect or of philosophy, but athletes, like Pindar's patrons, art-critics, art-patrons, soldiers. We hear it over and over again from Plutarch that Aratus, in his appearance and in his policy, showed himself of a coarse type and a mean temper, preferring surprises and chicanery both in policy and war to open and fair conflicts. This type, we may be sure, was common enough among these aristocrats. But in their daily life, in their material comforts, in their plate and their pictures, their furniture and their statues, they took up the spirit of the age, and probably despised the materials of earlier, as they did the ideas of later, Hellenic life.

We now come to the most characteristic of all our classes of cities, the many new foundations which studded the whole Hellenistic world, and of which Alexandria and Antioch were the greatest and the most splendid examples. But these cities, again, were of various kinds. Many, such as Alexandreschata, and Candahar in Upper Asia, were mere military outposts, peopled by compulsory Hellenistic settlement, as were the outposts down the Red Sea. From these, indeed, came such curious results as the Greek kingdom of Bactria, and Greek settlers on the island of Socotora, but we can hardly think them to have been better off than cities of the far coasts of the Black Sea in the days of Dion Chrysostom, where men held the plough with one hand and the sword with the other, and read their Homer in the watch-towers while on the look-out for the invading barbarians.[1]

[1] Cf. the very interesting oration, xxxvi. (*Borysthenitic*us), of Dion Chrysostom.

Far more curious are the plantations of cities in the midst of old culture, in the neighbourhood of old and inhabited sites, and even as rivals of the foundations of rival kings. In such countries as Syria, Cilicia, Caria, where the Lagidae and Seleucidae struggle for pre-eminence, both build towns, and in close proximity. We may be certain that they felt secure of the allegiance of such towns to the power that founded them; but what privileges could they give, and how could they make it men's interest to come together from their settled homes into a new place? For surely the whole of these new cities, which are reckoned by hundreds, were not peopled by roving mercenaries or other adventurers.

Let us take the larger and more prominent case of the new capitals, and ask the same questions. Not only did Seleucus found Antioch and Ptolemy establish Alexandria as capitals, but the former did so in spite of the foundation of a splendid residency a few miles inland—Antigoneia—by Antigonus, who was killed at Ipsus. It may be possible, as Droysen holds, that this Antigoneia survived the foundation of the new capital, but of course the great body of its population must have migrated to Antioch.[1] It seems to have been a sort of religion in those days for every king or dynast to found his own capital. Pyrrhus did so at Ambracia, Prusias at Nicomedia, Attalus at Pergamum, Lysimachus at Lysimacheia, and so many others. As the Ptolemies each built themselves new palaces, like the kings of France or of England in recent times, so the Hellenistic sovrans who set up new kingdoms in every case set up

[1] In my opinion the whole of it. We know that the very tutelary deity of Antigoneia, the statue of the personified fortune of that city, was carried away and set up in Antioch (K. O. Müller *Antiqq. Antioch.* p. 41, ed. Calvary).

new capitals, where they established their court. Here no doubt the expenses of the royal household, the garrison, the officials, produced considerable business, and people would be glad to settle at the centre of affairs to make money, even were there no special privileges or immunities promised to the new citizens. The example of Alexander, so brilliantly followed by Ptolemy and Seleucus, must have stimulated lesser dynasts to imitate them.

But all this is not enough to account for the sudden increase of city life all over the world, and to explain why the myriad population changed from country life, or the life of villages, into that of towns. Take, for example, the case of Palestine and Syria. Not to speak of Antioch, Seleucia, Laodicea and Apamea, there were scores of cities founded either on the coast (Ptolemais, Joppa, Akko, etc.) or along the Jordan, where Bethshan was renamed Scythopolis, and where a Decapolis of cities, among them a Dion and a Pella, attest the invasion of Macedonians all through Coele-Syria as far as Damascus.[1] There must have been at that epoch of the world a strong natural tendency towards this kind of life, a tendency which the kings turned to their own advantage.

We may see the same thing on a small scale in the England of the present century. Since the country towns have been well paved and lighted and the houses made comfortable, since there have been newspapers and clubs established, and better roads have brought many luxuries from the capital and from foreign lands, the yeoman who once lived contentedly in the country has found out that town life is far more agreeable, if not more profitable, than that of solitary farm-houses. So there are many districts

[1] I shall return to these plantations in connexion with the struggle of Judaism with Hellenism.

which, without any interference of the proprietor or the state, have become gradually depopulated and turned into large grass parks, while all the people have settled in the neighbouring towns.[1] This seems to have been the case on a gigantic scale in the epoch we are now studying. The new towns were all built on a large and comfortable model;[2] they were well paved; they had ample arrangements for lighting at night, and for a good water-supply; they had police arrangements, and good thoroughfares into them secured by land and water. These were in themselves privileges enough to tempt all the surrounding peasants, all the people who lived in old-fashioned incommodious villages, to settle in a fresh home. It is likely too that in those days trade outran small husbandry; if it required large farms and capital to make farming pay, the smaller yeomen would of course disappear and turn shopkeepers. In any case trade was so stimulated by the systematising of the world's thoroughfares that it occupied an enormous number of people. Greek influence too was always in the direction of town life, for there was perhaps no second instance now of a place like Elis, where the rich proprietors were such complete country people that they

[1] There is a district, not far from Rugby, in Leicestershire, where several parishes have become empty; in one of them the parson is now not appointed, in the next he has but one family under his charge. A few men with dogs look after the splendid herds of cattle which graze upon this solitude. In the last century all this land was tilled; now the people have drifted into Rugby, and taken to town life and town occupations.

[2] The intersection of two great main streets at right angles marked the centre of the city, where we may generally place the founder's shrine. The lesser streets ran parallel to either of these main thoroughfares, and so at right angles with the other. Palermo is still a specimen of such a plan, which was first used by Hippodamos in laying out the Peiraeus.

hardly ever came into town, and had their interests looked after by the officials who dwelt there. The sacrosanct character of Elis, and its consequent freedom from raids and invasions, had been the prime condition of this survival. But when the forty-five years' war set in, it was found very unpractical. The exception, however, which is noted as such by Polybius, proves the generality of the rule.

We shall now turn to the capital of Attalus as a typical specimen, and look out upon the Hellenistic world from this new and brilliant centre.

CHAPTER XIV

PERGAMUM AND ITS POSITION IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD[1]

KING LYSIMACHUS, towards the end of his life, had entrusted the fort of Pergamum with its treasure—9000 talents—to an officer called Philetaerus, a man of no family but of ability and vigour. He is said to have fallen into disfavour with the Egyptian Arsinoe when she was Queen of Lysimachus, no doubt in connexion with the various towns she received as dower. For one of them, Amastris, was apparently held by Eumenes, the brother or nephew of Philetaerus, and if the latter, his successor at Pergamum. However, the murder of Lysimachus's son by the wiles of Arsinoe and Ptolemy Keraunus kept Lysimachus distracted, and most likely, when Seleucus advanced against him, Philetaerus, who was an opportunist, and steered his way by fair promises and attentions paid to the nearest great power,[2]

[1] The great publication by the Museum of Berlin of the antiquities and inscriptions of Pergamon now in progress (1890-96) enables us to say something more definite concerning the development of this most interesting kingdom. But the history of Pergamum has yet to be written. Our historical accounts of the Attalids are derived from Strabo and Pausanias, both of whom have interesting digressions on the Pergamene kingdom.

[2] πολιτευόμενος δὲ ὑποσχέσεων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης θεραπείας ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸν ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἐγγὺς παρόντα, says Strabo xiii. 623. There is no connexion between Eumenes of Amastris and the famous Eumenes of

showed himself ready to adopt the Seleucid side. He was unmolested by Seleucus, and when the latter was murdered by Keraunus, purchased the body for a great sum, and burnt it with pomp, sending the ashes to Antiochus, the new Seleucid king. By these means he secured himself with the new ruler of Asia,[1] and seems to have escaped, in spite of his treasure, invasion from the Galatae, for, dying (in 263 B.C.) at the ripe age of eighty, he is said to have bequeathed his command to his nephew Eumenes, the dynast of Amastris in Pontus.

But although not a word transpires concerning any difficulties regarding his accession in our extant historians, we now know from a very interesting inscription[2] that there was a dangerous conspiracy of the mercenaries in the forts of Philetaeria and Attaleia, as well as of some of the inhabitants of the country, fomented by Eumenes, son of Attalus, which was only overcome by the new dynast granting to the mercenaries considerable immunities and 'fixity of tenure' in their privileges. The mercenaries on their side swear him loyalty. It appears further from this curious text that the dynasty attained to divine, or at least heroic honours, long before Attalus I. took the name of king owing to the victory over the Galatians. When each sovran died, he was called 'the god [Eumenes] the Benefactor,' or his corre-

Cardia, whose life Plutarch has written (above, pp. 41 *sq.*). We now know that the dynast's younger brother Attalus, married to Antiochis, sister of the Syrian queen Laodike, contended at Olympia, and won a chariot-race, celebrated in an epigram (*Inschr. von Pergamon* i. No. 10); also that Philetaerus lent money to the Greek cities near him to purchase concessions from the new king of Syria.

[1] Cf. a biting epigram, which cost the writer his life, Strabo xiv. 1, 39:—

πορφύρεοι μώλωπες ἀπορριχήματα γάζης
Λυσιμάχου, Λυδῶν ἄρχετε καὶ Φρυγίης.

[2] *Inschr. von P.* No. 13.

sponding name.[1] This is what we can say with certainty concerning the rise of the Pergamene dynasty.

When Eumenes had secured the succession, it seems that Antiochus Soter, though bound by ties of gratitude to Philetaerus, thought it now time to interfere, and essayed to subdue the new dynast of Pergamum by arms. But he was defeated in a battle near Sardis by Eumenes, and died too soon after, in battle with the Galatae, to make any renewed attempt upon Pergamum. So Eumenes was for the moment secure in his possessions, which embraced a district, we know not how large, round Pergamum. Here he maintained himself for twenty-two years, and in the strange complexities and confusions of the period we cannot find his name connected with any great war or treaty, until he asserted himself against Antiochus Hierax, the son of Theos, near the end of his life.

No doubt our information is at this moment very defective.[2] We only know that Antiochus II. (Theos) had his hands full. He made an expedition by the Hellespont into Thrace, where he brought to his side many towns, in opposition to the policy of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who was aiming at the complete dominion of the Levant by his fleets and armies. But there is not a word of either king being helped or opposed by Eumenes. Presently Antiochus is entitled *Theos*, a god, by the grateful inhabitants of Miletus, whom he rescued from a tyrant. He is then said to have given freedom, that is, of course, communal freedom, to the cities of Ionia. But not a word about Pergamum or the towns under its sway. The silence of our authorities is most curious. Amid all the wars, tumults, treaties, alliances of

[1] This appears from Nos. 18 and 43 in the published inscriptions.

[2] We are now in the gap between our remnants of Diodorus and the opening of Polybius—the obscurest period in all Hellenistic history.

this disturbed period, Pergamum seems an oasis of rest, a harbour of security, and it may, indeed, be said of this Eumenes, *bene qui latuit vixit.*[1]

It was just the moment when all the great kingdoms, in addition to their wars with one another, were threatened with dangerous revolts or new combinations within their immediate territories. Ptolemy had to contend with the diversion made by Demetrius the Fair in Cyrene (about 255 B.C.). Antiochus Theos was in vain endeavouring to overcome the great revolt of Arsaces, who founded the Parthian kingdom in the upper provinces of the Seleucid empire. Antigonus Gonatas, now an old man, was face to face with the growth of the Achaean league under Aratus, which threatened to destroy his influence in Greece. So Eumenes I. guided his course successfully, like his uncle, between the Scylla of diplomacy and the Charybdis of conquest. His immunity from the Galatae is, perhaps, the most curious feature of his life, and may have been bought with heavy black-mail, for the first great act of his brilliant successor, Attalus I., was to meet these barbarians in battle, and gain over them a great victory.

We hear from Diogenes Laertius, in his *Life of Arkesilaos*, that Eumenes esteemed that philosopher particularly, and trusted to him for personal recommendations of officers. The relations of the rising culture of Pergamum with Athens were very close, and of the next Attalid we hear similar stories of his intimacy with Lakydes, Arkesilaos's successor in the Academy, for whom he adorned a special garden (Lakydeion) in the Academy at Athens. But later

[1] It is reported in Athenaeus, on the authority of the chronologist Ctesicles, that he died of drunkenness. This would account for his obscurity in external politics, but not for his safety from invasion or other disturbance.

on we find not the Academy but the Stoa prevailing at Pergamum. I attribute this to the readiness of the Stoics, who were cosmopolitans, to reside there, while the Academicians were essentially Athenian, and declined repeated invitations to visit the Attalids, Lakydes with the *mot* that portraits were best seen from a distance.

If Eumenes I. is obscure, Attalus I., his first cousin, and son of a third brother of Philetaerus, was exceptionally celebrated. He reigned from 241 to 197 B.C., while all the other courts in the Hellenistic world changed hands, and he maintained throughout his life not only power but great respect among men. It was to him that were due most of the noble buildings which adorned his new capital, and he celebrated his first great victory, and his assumption of the title *king*, by splendid art-offerings not only at home but in Athens and elsewhere.

He had in fact succeeded to the Asiatic portion of the great kingdom of Lysimachus, and when the Galatae were checked, there was no one to prevent his city becoming the real capital of western Asia Minor.

For the Seleucid throne was now occupied by a boy, who was in conflict with his own brother, and had, moreover, the Parthian revolt to settle, if he could. Antigonus Gonatas was a man of eighty, and when he died in 239 B.C. his successor had to deal with the Achaean and Aetolian leagues in the south, and the inroads of the terrible Illyrians and Dardanians on the north-west. In Egypt, Euergetes, after his brilliant campaign into Asia, which had for the moment crushed the Seleucids, and even emulated the march of Alexander to India, was content to cripple Syria by diplomatic means, and was necessarily a friend of Attalus so long as Pergamum could not rank as a first-rate power. Hence the king of Pergamum had only to defend himself

against the Seleucid attempts to recover from him the large territory reaching up to the Taurus he had annexed in Asia Minor. He easily disposed of Antiochus Hierax, Seleucus II.'s brother, who was endeavouring to establish an independent sovranty in Asia Minor, but was in far greater difficulties when the king himself came against him some years later (222 B.C.). Seleucus was indeed assassinated during the campaign, but the real command lay with his uncle Achaeus, the ablest man of his day, who defeated Attalus, took back all Asia Minor, and for a long time besieged him closely in his capital.

But the loyalty of Achaeus, which had at first been proof against the diadem, gave way before these successes; his assumption of the insignia of royalty brought against him the young king Antiochus III. (the Great), and this saved Attalus. Accordingly, Attalus maintained his power, and, living with probity, and in harmony with his family, spent a long life in making his capital the rival of Alexandria. He began to collect a library; he gathered scholars and critics about him; the Stoic philosophy found a special home at Pergamum; nor do we know of any Hellenistic city, except perhaps Rhodes, where life was more refined, morals better, or learning more respected.[1] The good example of the royal house, which managed even indirect successions to the throne without jealousy or crime, must have acted with wholesome effect on the population.

We can now give some further explanation of the curious fact mentioned by Polybius (xxii. 11) that this Attalus acquired from the Aetolians, who had obtained it from the

[1] It appears from *Mitth.* xiii. p. 14 that the Macedonians were not the leading caste in this kingdom, which was therefore intended to be rather Hellenic than Hellenistic. But they were tolerated and favoured in the inner frontier as loyal and good soldiers. The inner frontier towns did not become Pergamene till 190 B.C.

Romans in 210 B.C., the island of Aegina, which henceforth was part of the Pergamene kingdom, and was governed by an officer sent from Pergamum. A series of inscriptions (48-50 in the collection) show that Attalus imported old works of art from Aegina to adorn his capital, with a notice on each of the original artist and its provenance. We can now therefore see at least one reason for the curious purchase of the island for 30 talents. It was no doubt a treasure-house of archaic art. In the days of Pindar, Aeginetan victors had been the foremost celebrated in his odes. When the fashion of athlete statues came in, there must have been many dedicated to shrines by natives of the island. Now, in its decayed and forlorn condition, these works were no longer prized, and probably in danger of destruction, so that Attalus was both protecting them from loss and adorning his capital with archaic treasures by transferring them to Pergamum.

We also know from the remarkable researches of Brunn and others that to Attalus may be ascribed the high merit of having produced or fostered a new school of sculpture, the so-called Pergamene, of which we have such remarkable remains that we may fairly call it the most original art-development of this century. Attalus presented to Athens, and set up in the Acropolis, four elaborate groups of statues —one mythological (gods and Titans), one heroic (Athenians and Amazons), one historical (Athenians and Persians), and the last historical also, but what was quite new, a composition celebrating his own victory over the Gauls.[1]

[1] Art-critics have identified seventeen types of famous statues as due to the votive offerings of Attalus. There is also still at Athens a ruined colonnade on the south side of the Acropolis, known as the stoa (or portico) of Eumenes (II.), another west of the Areopagus, known as that of Attalus (II.).

Such an ideal treatment of present events was an advance upon the portrait-statues of the Macedonian peers slain at the Granicus, which Alexander had set up. For from the extant remains in various museums we know that the actual defeat, the dying anguish, the savage despair of the barbarians—these were the main features of the fourth group. Akin to these, and of the same date and school, are the famous dying Gaul (once called a gladiator), and the group called Paetus and Arria, which represents a Gallic warrior, who has just slain his wife, committing suicide, while he seeks to sustain the relaxing form beside him. These two representations of suicide, for the dying Gaul is evidently a parallel, picture not only the rough, clumsy, though powerful type of barbarian strength as opposed to Hellenic grace, but also that tendency to despair and to self-destruction which to the Greeks was so strange.[1] The great national enemy must be represented as terrible, as inhuman perhaps, so as to enhance the glory of the Attalid victory, and yet it would not be art if the spectator were not deeply affected by the intensity of the despair, and the profound truth in the representation of the supreme agony of death. In older Greek art barbarians, if produced, are only indicated externally, by their dress or their defeat. Now it is the naked Gaul whose essentially non-Hellenic features are brought before us; his defeat is not material but spiritual; though not slain he abandons life, and executes upon himself the work of the victor. We shall return to the art of Pergamum

[1] This is the point insisted upon by Overbeck *Griech. Plastik* ii. 225. But if the dignity of suicide was foreign to the older and purer Greeks, what shall we say of the results of Stoic teaching, brought in from semi-Greek provinces like Lycia, where it was certainly not uncommon in older times, and taught, as we know, sedulously in Pergamum? Possibly this philosophy may have aided in making suicide an honourable act, and hence fit for plastic art.

in the next generation, and show its persistence under the Attalids;[1] but this we may here say, that if Hellenism showed power in architecture (by perfecting the Corinthian order and the arch), in poetry, as we have seen, and in painting, nowhere was it greater and more original than here.

As we know that Attalus's new capital gave this great stimulus to art, and in the next century, through rivalry with Alexandria, to criticism also, we should expect to find some new blossom of literature. It is strange that nothing of the kind can be traced directly to Pergamum, beyond the certain fact that Stoic philosophers lived and taught there, and that some flatterers of Attalus wrote memoirs of his youth and acts. But I think there is indirect evidence enough to associate with the Asia Minor of this generation, and therefore of course with the Attalids, the rise of that new school of eloquence called by the critics *Asianic*,[2] as opposed to Attic. The founder or leader of this school, Hegesias, hailed from Magnesia, by Mount Sipylos, and its diffusion is always localised in the cities of Asia Minor, which, as we know, were either nominally free or under the sway of Attalus. This latter condition was particularly the case with inland towns, which could not join the league, or at all events secure the protection, of the Rhodians. Nor do we ever hear of the sway of the Attalids as being severe enough to kill eloquence, either forensic or judicial, within the domain of communal affairs. This, however, is certain, that while the literary hot-bed of Alexandria produced quantities of poetry and of science it produced no oratory, and hardly any history, in spite of the example set by the first king, in his *Memoirs* of Alexander. While, therefore,

[1] Below, chap. xix.

[2] I suggested this word long ago as suitable to distinguish the products of Asia Minor from those of Inner Asia, which are *Asiatic*.

poetry and science flourished at Alexandria, history and oratory made themselves a new home in Asia Minor. We do not hear that Hegesias taught or exhibited at Pergamum, but his fashion must have been the fashion of that capital, and agrees very well with what we know of the rest of Pergamene art.

The sculpture was, however, decidedly better than the eloquence. Solid and motionless marble is easier to compare with rival works, and its variations from a great type are readily seen. In the far more subtle and varying art of literary style it is very easy to wander from great models, to fail even in direct imitation, to seek originality, and suffer by the very success itself. The fashion of the day was to strike out something new and sparkling, to hit points, make sudden effects, and for the rest to aim at studious simplicity. Nothing seemed to Hegesias and his school greater waste of labour than the style of Demosthenes, who composed every sentence of his arguments in elaborate and carefully constructed periods, and almost systematically avoided flashes of wit or digressions of ornament. And it may be conceded that if you do not thoroughly study Demosthenes's circumstances, and become one of his actual audience at Athens in Philip's day, his speeches are dull reading. It requires a special training in the laws of Greek rhetoric to find out his artfully disguised artifices, some of which have not been recovered till the present day.[1]

The new Asianic rhetors, therefore, in opposition to the decaying Attic school, which still strove to imitate the last ripe fruit of Attic liberty, chose Lysias for their model,

[1] By the genius of Blass. Cf. the account of these matters in my *Hist. of Greek Lit.* ii. pp. 340 *sq.*, and the fullest and newest exposition by the discoverer in his *Att. Beredsamkeit* ii. pp. 138-217 of the 2nd edition (on Isocrates); and on Demosthenes, *ibid.* iii. 100 *sq.*

though they were just as far from the grace of that archaic figure with its stereotyped smile, as they were from the masterful ease of Hypereides. It was Spohr professing to turn back from Beethoven's complexity to Mozart, and reproducing the old master's simplicity sugared and seasoned with the sweets of nineteenth-century harmonies. In the very same way Hegesias, though he wrote short and plain sentences, could not dispense with those epigrammatic or antithetic smartnesses which were only tolerable when a very strict taste controlled them; and this taste seems lost among the Asianic rhetors and their public. Dionysius, a very severe critic of the Augustan time, when men had come round again to appreciate the real greatness of Greek literature, and to reverence the golden age of eloquence, will not allow Hegesias the smallest credit. He says that not a single page of his works is without the most shocking faults of style, and that such composition cannot arise from ignorance, which must sometimes chance to be right, but from a deliberate preference for the wrong. It is quite possible that this particular judgment is too severe, but the critic justly notes the remarkable decadence in literary taste which marked the diffusion of Greek letters through all manner of semi-Greek and barbarous people.

The fragments of Hegesias show the very same contrast to those of Demosthenes that the writings of Macaulay show to those of Gibbon. Instead of the long periods, the carefully rounded and rhythmical clauses, we have short terse statements in serried series, and without any grammatical links.[1] He was guilty, moreover, of 'effeminate measures,' such as trochees and tribrachs, and other such violations of

[1] *e.g.* from Strabo p. 396 *ὁρῶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν καὶ τὸ τῆς περιττῆς τριαίνης ἐκεῖθε σημεῖον· ὁρῶ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γέγονα μύστης· ἐκεῖνο Λεωκόριον· τοῦτο Θησεῖον· οὐ δύναμαι δηλῶσαι καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον.*

the mysteries of Greek prose; what was far worse, he was guilty of false pathos, of exaggerated sentiment, of misplaced appeals to the sympathy of his audience.

All these things are very important in showing us the shady side of Hellenism as an epoch of culture. It was then, as always, the case, that a very wide diffusion of letters brought with it, as natural consequences, shallowness of knowledge and superficiality of taste; nor should we forget in the face of this decadence that the school of Alexandria was so laboriously learned in Hellenic lore, and so conscientious in the pursuit of science. We ought to judge it not by contrast to Attic purity and grace, but in comparison with the Asianic fashions, the flashy display of Hegesias and his followers.[1]

The peculiar morality and refinement of the court and city of Attalus will best appear if we consider what had happened to the rulers of Egypt and Syria who were his contemporaries. The young king Ptolemy III. (Euergetes) had been married upon his father's death to Berenike, princess of Cyrene, a young lady of great spirit, but of still greater adventures. Demetrius the Fair had been sent from

There is a very elaborate criticism by Agatharchides, quoting many idle conceits of Hegesias, in the Fragments of the 5th book *de mari rubro*. C. Müller *Geog. Graeci Minores* i. 120, 1.

[1] Wilamowitz says (*Antig. von Karystos* p. 155) that from Pergamum and its intimate ally Cyzicus came at this time the impulse to revive the Ionic dialect in literature. If this be so, it was a remarkable attempt to assert a peculiar place in Hellenistic literature, and to make Pergamum a seat of distinct culture. But to revive the old Ionic dialect, which had long disappeared from literature, and was even passing away from the people's tongue, was the same sort of attempt as we now see in Ireland to galvanise the old Irish language into life. The people in the smaller towns near Pergamum, such as Temnos, spoke Aeolic and not Ionic, as we know from a recovered inscription of the third century B.C. (*Inschr. von Pergamon* No. 5).

Macedonia to obtain her kingdom with her hand, but while she was waiting to be of marriageable age, he had beguiled the time by intriguing with her mother, and Berenike was obliged to have him put to death, perhaps in her mother's chamber, and almost under her own eyes. After this experience she married the young king of Egypt—doubtless also as a political alliance, but one which seems to have turned out well.[1] Yet no sooner had she entered upon her new happiness than her bridegroom was called away to avenge the horrid murder of his sister,[2] who had been sent, a new wife, to the aging Antiochus Theos, king of Syria, on the condition of his repudiating his former wife Laodike (sister of Achaeus), as well as her children, now growing boys. The king had made an expedition to Asia Minor, where (at Sardis) he again fell under the influence of the divorced Laodike, who forthwith poisoned him, and had her son proclaimed king, with the natural consequence that her party in Antioch rose against the new Egyptian queen, and murdered her and her infant child.

[1] I have endeavoured to explain, in my *Introduction to the Revenue Papyrus* (Oxford, 1896), the causes of the long delay of this marriage, which did not take place till eight or nine years after Ptolemy had taken over Cyrene. No Ptolemy seems to have married till he was actually king. Berenike is always officially called the king's wife and *sister*, though she was only his first cousin.

[2] Such was the luxury of the Egyptian court, that her father, Philadelphus, had made arrangements to send the water of the Nile for her use to Antioch; she was, perhaps, his favourite child, sacrificed to policy, and condemned to a dreadful fate. But to send fresh water to Antioch was, indeed, like our 'coals to Newcastle,' for no city was more splendidly provided, not to speak of the high pressure obtained from the mountain streams. The tanks of Alexandria must have seemed to the Syrians contemptible, yet the water of the Nile was always thought particularly wholesome, and what was more important, in this case, a specific to produce fruitfulness in women. This last was probably the chief reason of the precaution.

Here is the sort of anecdote we find connected with these tragedies. When Laodike was clearing away the partisans of Egypt along with her faithless husband, one of her retinue, Danae, the daughter of Leontium, that well-known courtesan who had been a hearer of Epicurus, saved the life of her lover, Sophron, the commandant of Ephesus, by warning him of his danger. She was accordingly cast from a cliff by Laodike, to whom she refused any explanation, going to her death with the remark 'that it was no wonder many people were sceptical about the gods, seeing that she, who had been faithful to her lover, was now dying for it, while Laodike, who had been guilty of every kind of treachery, had obtained all her desires.' On the other hand, we have queen Berenike cutting off her hair, and offering it in a temple in fulfilment of a vow for the safety of her husband.[1]

The campaign of Ptolemy III. into Asia exceeded anything done since Alexander's time. He conquered as much as he chose. He marched as far as India. He came back round Arabia, and explored the far parts of the Red Sea. So it appears from an inscription (Greek) which he set up at Adule, far down the Red Sea, on a marble throne, where it was read in the fifth century by the monk Cosmas Indicopleustes, and fortunately copied by him so far as it survived.[2] But the king was no Pyrrhus or Demetrius. He probably recognised in their new kingdoms the Bactrian and Parthian dynasts. He appointed Xanthippus, the conqueror of Regulus at Carthage, to the satrapy of the Mesopotamian provinces. He set up Antiochus Hierax,

[1] See above, p. 259, on the *Coma Berenices* of Catullus.

[2] The reader will find the text either in the *CIG* iii. 5127 or in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 199. The allegations of the inscription, which might seem exaggerated, are supported by a text found at Lesbos, and published in the *BCH* iv. p. 436.

younger brother of the young king Seleucus II., to dispute with him and with Attalus, Asia Minor. He held Seleucia on the Orontes to give him command of Syria, and then, having apparently dismembered the Seleucid empire, he was content.

His danger lay not there, it lay in the combination of second-rate powers, such as Pergamum and Rhodes, to prevent the disturbance of the balance of power in the Levant. But enough of politics. What I want rather to insist upon here, in contrast to the truly Hellenic development of Pergamum, is the strong Egyptian reaction against Hellenism which appears to have begun under Euergetes, and to have been favoured by him.

In the first place, his great care, in his eastern campaign, was to seek out and bring back all the Egyptian gods and sacred things carried away by the Persians as trophies to Babylon, Susa, and Persepolis.[1] Upon his return he built in memory of his victories not a Greek temple at Alexandria, but an Egyptian temple at Esne in Upper Egypt, that small temple on which Champollion and Rosellini read his inscriptions, but which has since been destroyed.

At Karnak he built a great Pylon known by his name, which shows, by the way, how he was gradually breaking away from Greek to Egyptian fashions, for here in the doorway he is represented in a mongrel, or semi-Greek costume, a very rare thing in subsequent Ptolemaic monuments. This Pylon is an offering from Euergetes and Berenike to their parents, Philadelphus and Arsinoe. A short way to the north-east are the ruins of another temple

[1] We now know that both his grandfather and his father boasted of the same attentions towards the Egyptian religion, so that we cannot but suspect the assertion to have been a polite formula, copied from one inscription to another. But of all the Ptolemies this king had the greatest opportunity of really doing what others boasted to have done.

built by Euergetes, near the village of Nega-el-Fokanu. He added to the great temple of Philae, begun by Philadelphus. But by far his greatest work was the foundation of the great temple of Edfu in the tenth year of his reign, a temple at which every Ptolemy down to Auletes showed his zeal for the national religion. The successive steps by which succeeding Ptolemies finished this splendid edifice are preserved in the hieroglyphic account on the circuit wall of the temple which Dümichen has published.[1] These remains, and no doubt there are more, show the king to have been an assiduous builder of Egyptian temples.[2]

Then we know from the famous inscription found at San [Tanis], drawn up in the ninth year of his reign, that the Egyptian priests assembled in solemn conclave yearly to transact business with him, and that they received from him many privileges. Let us consider this piece of evidence more particularly.

The inscription found by Lepsius at San in 1865 is dated 7th March 238 B.C. (according to the corrections to be made for the aberration of the Egyptian from solar months), and, therefore, comes after the king's great Asiatic campaigns. It is chiefly from the just-mentioned inscription of Adule that we know the extent of these campaigns.[3] The present document is on a stone 7 feet by 2½ feet, and in the edition of Lepsius (Berlin, 1866) there is no mention of the demotic version, which was at first not noticed, being engraved not on the face, but round the edge of the stone. There are thirty-seven lines of hieroglyphs to seventy-six

[1] *Zeitsch. für Aegyptologie* vol. i. pp. 1 *sqq.*

[2] The reader will most easily find these buildings described in Murray's *Egypt* pp. 495, 503, 524.

[3] I have added some very curious new evidence from a text I discovered among the Petrie Papyri (vol. II. xlv).

of Greek, showing how compendious a form of writing and of language the old Egyptians possessed. The text is practically complete, not mutilated like the Rosetta stone, so that the whole document is before us.

The priests were assembled at Alexandria for the anniversary feast of the king's coronation in February, when a young princess, called, like the queen, Berenike, suddenly died about the 20th February. This the priests made the occasion for a great public lamentation, and remained from the 5th of Tybi (23rd February) to the 17th (6th March). Before their departure to their several sacerdotal duties, the decree was drawn up. I give only an abstract of the main portions of it, as the reader has already had a specimen of the details of such a text above.[1] After the date and titles of the king and queen, and an account of the assembly of all the priests at Canopus, they declare:—

'WHEREAS the king and queen have shown much benevolence to the temples of the country, and are ever increasing the honours of the gods at great cost and with great care, and the king has brought back in triumph the images of the gods robbed by the Persians, and restored them to their several temples, and whereas by his successful wars he has kept the land in peace, and by his laws and ordinances in prosperity; and whereas when the river Nile one year failed to rise sufficiently, and all were in dread of a famine, such as had occurred on previous occasions, the king, by his remission of taxes and importation of corn from foreign lands, saved the people from distress, so doing permanent benefit, and leaving a record of his goodness—.

[1] p. 189. The complete text of the Canopus decree is now printed in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* pp. 229 *sq.* Hitherto it had only been accessible in Lepsius's expensive monograph.

'IT IS DECREED: That the worship of the previous kings and queens shall be increased by priesthoods, offerings, and worship to the gods Euergetae (Benefactor Gods), and that a fifth clan shall be added to the existing four clans (*φυλαί*) of priests in each temple, to be called the clan of the Benefactor Gods, with all the rights, privileges, etc., of the existing clans, with three holy days every month, and a yearly feast in honour of these gods. This great yearly feast for the whole land is to be celebrated on the day when the star of Isis rises, which is regarded in the holy writings as New Year's Day, but in this ninth year (of Euergetes's reign) is celebrated on the first of Payni, when the harvest and the rising of the Nile take place; the feast of the Euergetae is to be further celebrated at exact intervals of four solar days, by adding one day to every four years, so that it may coincide with the rising of the star, and show that what was deficient formerly in the arrangement of the feasts, in that summer feasts gradually moved into the winter, and *vice versa*, has been successfully emended and completed by the Benefactor Gods.[1]

'AND WHEREAS the daughter sprung from King Ptolemy and Queen Berenike, the Benefactor Gods, and also called Berenike, passed suddenly as a maiden into eternity, while the priests were present on their yearly visit, who made great lamentation, and persuaded the king and queen to set up the (new) goddess by the side of Osiris in the temple of Canopus, with many other honours and sacrifices then specified—IT IS DECREED: That she shall have honours in all the temples of Egypt, and a special yearly feast to

[1] This most important reform of the calendar, which shows that the Egyptian priests knew the true length of the solar year, 365¼ days, and had felt the inconvenience of the old year of 365 days, seems not to have been permanently adopted in Egypt. It would have made their calendar as accurate as ours.

last four days, and that a special image of her in gold adorned with precious stones is to be set up in the temples, and carried forth by the priests in their solemn processions, to be seen, honoured, and adored by all the people, under the title *Berenike, Princess of Maidens.*[1] Further, that the diadem upon her head shall differ from that of her mother's images, and shall consist of two ears (of corn), and between them the serpent-diadem, but behind this a papyrus-shaped sceptre proper, such as goddesses hold in their hands, and about which the tail of the serpent-diadem shall be wound, in order that from the arrangement of the diadem the title of Berenike shall be recognised according to the ideographs of the sacred writing'; and, among further honours, 'that the maiden daughters of priests shall worship her with special offerings hereafter described, and at the yearly feasts both men and women singers are to sing her praises, which the sacred scribes shall deliver in writing to the master of the singing, and of which copies shall be made in the sacred books, and that the daughters of the priests shall receive certain allowances, marked as *the bread of Berenike*, from the temple revenues. This decree to be set up in hieroglyphic, Egyptian (demotic), and Greek writing in all temples of the first, second, and third ranks.'

From all this we might fairly expect that Hellenistic art and literature would not flourish under this king, as it had done under Philadelphus. There were indeed great people at the Museum, especially Eratosthenes and Apollonius, now elderly men, who survived from the old king's time, but the supply begins to diminish, and we have no new names to

[1] As among the Attalids, so here the deceased princess, being translated to the actual gods, receives higher honours than her deified but still living parents. Priestly flattery, however, soon abolished this distinction, and the fifth Ptolemy is honoured (on the Rosetta stone) as an actual god.

compare with Callimachus, Apollonius, and Theocritus. We do not hear of a single Greek sculptor at Alexandria, though so many hundreds of Egyptian artists must have been in the royal employment. The paintings the king prized were those of earlier artists sent him from Greece by Aratus, but in this art too we know of no Alexandrian school.[1] If I mistake not, the king had felt that his father went too far in the Hellenic direction, and he determined to favour a national reaction.

The distracted condition of the Seleucid empire, the struggles of Seleucus Callinicus and his brother Antiochus Hierax, which lasted for years, then the disturbances on the death of Seleucus—all these events prevented Antioch from taking its place as the leader of Asiatic Hellenism. Seleucus cannot have been without enterprise; for a whole new quarter of Antioch bore his name as its founder. Hence there must have been peace and prosperity enough to attract many new residents to that capital. Still we hear that the building of the city was not completed according to its original plan till the reign of Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes). Accordingly, with the Egyptian king favouring home interests, and indeed in the latter years of his life apparently wanting in vigour, perhaps from constitutional ill-health; with the old Macedonian king dead, and succeeded by a Demetrius who is only known through his wars, the centre of gravity as regards culture and letters shifted from the greater capitals to Pergamum, as we have seen, to Rhodes, which we shall presently consider, and to Greece itself, where Aratus was

[1] The great essay of M. Schreiber, in the *Leipzig Academy Trans.* for 1894, shows that it was in toreutic, jewelry, bronze-work, and other delicate products intended for the inner decorations of rich houses that the Alexandrians exercised their skill, and afforded the models for all the better work of that kind found in Roman palaces.

making the Achaean League an important power, and, above all, was supporting the cause of the rich aristocrats and the people of taste against the hungry democracy of poor who were clamouring for better land laws and for social reforms.

I do not know why we never hear of this land question in Asia Minor, or in the other Hellenistic regions. In Greece it is the main feature of the epoch. We saw how it affected Sparta with its royal demagogue. In Achaea the whole life of Aratus was devoted to keeping it quiet. It had distracted Athens not many years before. But in Asia, owing, I conjecture, to some radical difference in tenure, I am not aware that this problem existed. One inscription at least tells us that there were large royal domains all over Asia Minor, and that upon the foundation of a new city the sovran ceded to the citizens a tract of this land, so that here at least the difficulty was settled in a very simple way. Possibly the king got more return from such a gift than from his unoccupied acres. The great number of new foundations, like Alexandria Troas and Pergamum, or of re-foundations, like the new Smyrna, made it easy there at least to regulate the land question according to modern requirements; nor do we hear much of old Asiatic cities, whence, perhaps, the discontented were drafted off to settle in the new. In Greece, on the other hand, we hear of hardly any new towns; land seems to have passed gradually into fewer hands, and to have been held on old titles, hence any land reform was sure to meet with violent opposition. But these are only surmises. We must be content to note the fact and wait for a clearer explanation.

I will conclude this chapter with the natural reflections suggested by that wholesale turning of country-people into towns people, which might perhaps be almost called a definition

of Hellenism. The dominant nation, the Macedonians, did not condescend to Hellenise themselves in this sense. There was no foundation of great towns, or gathering in of rustic peasants throughout Macedonia, so that this country, like Italy, still possessed a yeomanry that made excellent soldiers, but not men of letters or artists. Hence it was that the moment Macedonia ceased to be a dominant, and therefore military, nation, it ceased to exist in the world's history.[1] But there were few parts of the civilised world —perhaps only Sogdiana with its Aryan barons and Elis with its country gentry—which remained in this condition. Everywhere else the pleasures or privileges of town life, of that long-established Hellenic form of culture, were either forced upon the nations or offered them as a bribe.

And so the Hellenistic world,—northern Greece, the Propontis, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, all adopted the virtues and vices of towns-people and abandoned those of country folk. Theocritus has to go to the uplands of Sicily and southern Italy to find his pictures of pastoral and country life; for the harvest scene at Cos is really one of mock shepherds enjoying the vintage at their suburban villas. People became, I suppose, less hardy and fonder of luxury, less disposed to fight as soldiers, and more ready to settle disputes by diplomacy, or if not, by the help of mercenaries. No doubt the contempt of the country bumpkin and the pride of *urbanity* increased, and so also the higher esteem of trade as compared with farming.

These things may be inferred from the nature of the case, though unfortunately we have hardly any contemporary documents to illustrate them. In Theocritus's dialogue of the fishermen—often denied to him because it differs widely from his other works, as if that were not to be expected from

[1] Further reasons will be discussed in my last chapter.

a man trying all sorts of experiments in poetry—the very language of the lower classes living apart from the town is represented as differing widely from polite Greek. In the book of *Ecclesiasticus*, which was not composed without indirect influences of Hellenism, we hear as acknowledged experience—'How can he have wisdom whose talk is of bullocks?'

We must, however, come down much later to find a deliberate sketch of the contrasts of town and country life. In the remarkable prose idyll of Dion Chrysostom,[1] which only the stolidity of a full-blown pedant could mistake for a narrative of real facts, Dion represents himself as shipwrecked on the wild outer coast of Euboea, and hospitably entertained by two families of simple country people, living by hunting and husbandry, and spending their pure and guileless lives 'far from the madding crowd.' In the course of his romantic sojourn with these people one of them narrates to him the only visit any of them ever paid to the city, and the strange manners of the people—noisy, litigious, anxious to plunder every quiet country man, and full of contemptuous amusement at the rude innocence of the boor.

This fancy picture is the climax in which the city tendencies of Hellenism resulted. No doubt the shepherds of Theocritus, with their strong passions and outspoken animality, are more real than the charming hinds of Dion, with their unselfishness, their generosity, their moral purity. But still there is a deep-seated feeling, which has some justification, that life in the midst of woods and mountains, spent in delving, planting, reaping, hunting, preserves certain qualities which are lost or soiled by the constant wear of city

[1] No. vii. of his Discourses, known as *Venaticus*. I have translated most of it in the volume which forms the sequel to this, viz. *The Greek World under Roman Sway* chap. xii.

life. As we now know that the crowding of human beings must generate animal poisons, so it also produces moral diseases. This was the weak point as well as the strength of Hellenism; the reason why Parthia held her own against it; why Rome so easily conquered it; and, when it had leavened the Roman Empire, this was the feature which gave to the empire that want of cohesion that made it fall before the barbarians, in whom Tacitus discerned the opposite type, the nomad and pastoral chieftain, contrasted with the urban and sedentary citizen.

This great fact in the civilisation of the world was created on a large scale in the century before us by the extending of the type of the old Greek city, with its assembly of citizens voting on their own affairs, to large countries, where every other kind of society was induced to accommodate itself to this. Here is the true importance of all these capitals, trading marts, military colonies, which collected and redistributed the population of the world. Where cities were not very thickly sown, great tracts of land must have gone into pasture, perhaps back into forest, like many tracts in the Southern States of North America since slave labour was abolished. Hence many centres of life did not support themselves, but trusted to the activity of merchants in conveying corn from those natural granaries which have for thousands of years produced a great surplus to feed the world. The stopping of the passage of the Bosporus meant famine prices, and was therefore a cosmopolitan calamity. But I will not anticipate the events of the next generation.

CHAPTER XV

THE MERCANTILE ASPECTS OF HELLENISM—LEAGUES AND FEDERATIONS—ARBITRATION—PUBLIC CREDIT

As we used Pergamum for our observing centre in the last chapter, so we may now transfer ourselves to the not very distant Rhodes, which occupied, as regards the great powers, a position not unlike the domain of Attalus, but with many interesting differences.[1] I have given already above (pp. 101 *sq.*) a brief account of the earlier history of the island up to the death of Alexander, and have described the great siege by Demetrius I.

This successful resistance to Demetrius at once secured the political position of Rhodes, which was maintained by a careful neutrality, by clearing the sea of pirates, by establishing uniform marine and commercial law, by offering secure banks for deposits and investments, and by the enlightened habit of affording mediation in cases of war. Nothing is more regrettable to students of the inner life of Hellenism than the scantiness of our information about

[1] The most recent work on Rhodes, which I have used all through this chapter, is Mr. Cecil Torr's *Rhodes in Ancient Times*. The author has gathered a vast body of facts, especially from the inscriptions, but the book requires a better literary plan and wants a much fuller index, by which the reader might find his way, not to say a public library close at hand, to supply the various texts which the author has used without quoting them except by references.

Rhodes during the eighty years following this great crisis. It was, of course, the essence of Rhodian policy to keep out of wars, which alas! form the staple of our histories.

It is only from stray notices and on political grounds that Droysen has inferred a war of Rhodes against its closest ally, Egypt, in the days of Euergetes's supremacy, when, after his magnificent progress through Asia, he seemed to have destroyed the balance of power and ruined the Seleucid kingdom. Then it was that the Rhodians seem to have taken the part of the Seleucids, either of Seleucus or of Antiochus Hierax his brother, and to have won a sea-battle against Chremonides, the Athenian exile who was now Ptolemy's admiral. The result, however, of this action was the acquisition or large increase of a province on the coast, called by the Rhodians the *Peraea*, or other side of the water, reaching from Kaunos to the Keramic Gulf, and bringing them a large tribute. We may compare it to the possessions of Holland in the Malay Archipelago, which defray the expenses of the home exchequer, and thus help to keep that small country in great material prosperity.

The annals of commerce no ancient historian ever dreamt of recording. We are therefore reduced to gather stray notices of Rhodian enterprise and art, and to use the pictures of Rhodian life to be found in far later days. The political prominence of the island begins with the advent of the three boys to the three great kingdoms about the year 221 B.C.

We know that during the previous eighty years the Rhodians effected a sort of league or combination among the leading cities on the Asiatic seaboard as far as the Bosporus. But there seem to be reasons to believe that Byzantium and Heracleia on the Euxine were not strictly in this federation. Apart from the great trade-produce of

the coasts of the Black Sea in leather, wheat, dried fish, cattle, slaves, etc., which these cities would gladly have kept for themselves, there was the northern caravan-route from the far East, which reached the sea about the present Batoum, or Trebizond, and which was the competing route with those through Syria, and by the Red Sea to Egypt. Hence the constant struggles of Egypt to maintain a footing in Thrace and the northern Aegean, the struggles of Syria to regain northern Asia Minor, and the great wealth and importance not only of the free Greek towns established there, but of the kingdoms of Pontus and Bithynia, with their new capitals and Hellenistic culture. These northern powers had, moreover, their special struggle with the Galatae, in which the Rhodians took no part, unless it be by furnishing Antiochus Soter with a general who defeated the barbarians in the 'elephant' victory.[1]

On the contrary, the history of the great siege by Demetrius, after which Ptolemy Soter was worshipped by them as a god, shows their close relations to Egypt. We hear also that Rhodian captains explored for Philadelphus the secrets of the western Mediterranean; Rhodes even had a law directing a fleet to go to sea every season, and there is evidence that naval commanders were conceded large powers in acting for the state. Rhodes undertook to clear the sea of pirates, as the Athenians had done, but in the siege of Demetrius we still hear of the 'arch-pirate' as a sort of recognised authority. It is more likely that the Rhodians compelled these corsairs, who always abounded about the southern coast of Asia Minor and in Crete, to come to terms with them, so as not to molest any ship trading under their flag. This was probably the inducement they held out to the Greek cities to join their league; for they certainly

[1] Cf. above, p. 168.

had the power of ruining, without going to war, any Levantine seaport which refused their alliance.[1]

Rhodes is said to have been founded by three older towns in the island, Lindus, Ialysos, and Cameirus, in 408 B.C., that is to say, at the moment when the naval supremacy of Athens was broken, and she could no longer keep the islands and coasts safe from pirates. It appears that very soon after, Cos, Cnidos, Halicarnassus, Iasos, Samos, Chios, Ephesus, all coined after the new standard adopted by Rhodes, and this extended even to Aenos, Cyzicus, and Byzantium, so that the elements of a league were already there. But I am not concerned with the early annals of the city. The value of Rhodian trade to the world was very clearly recognised by the first Antigonus, if it be true that when he sent Demetrius against them he ordered that the Rhodian merchants in Syria, Phoenicia, Cilicia, and

[1] On the interesting parallel of Venice and the Adriatic, here is a passage from Mr. Jackson's *Dalmatia* iii. 257 :—'Venice, the inheritor of the commercial greatness of Aquileja, had now attained a degree of maritime power that brought the coast cities, both of Dalmatia and Istria, under her influence. She had taken upon herself the sovereignty of the sea, and the charge of protecting the commerce and the marine of the riparian towns. Although there was not at first any question of political subjection, the cities of Istria had from an early period paid for the protection of the Venetians by a contribution in money, and by a contingent of men and armed vessels, which sailed with the Venetian fleet under the orders of the Venetian admiral, and helped to keep the police of the seas. These relations led to the acquisition of lands in Istria by Venetian nobles and ecclesiastical corporations, and the Republic began in time to assert an authority over the province which provoked resistance both from the Istrians themselves, and from the German marquis who represented the emperor or king of Italy. An attack by the Marquis Winter on the property of the Venetian citizens in Istria provoked the Senate to retaliate by suspending all commerce with the province: the Istrians were nearly ruined, and the marquis, with the bishops and representatives of the principal towns, was reduced to implore the pardon of the Republic, and to promise to respect the property of her citizens.'

Pamphylia should be unmolested. This was a position never attained by the merchants of Athens, both because the solidarity of the civilised world had not yet been appreciated, and because Athens was an ambitious empire, while Rhodes as yet only aspired to be the universal commercial go-between of all nations. For this purpose it avoided definite treaties, though friendly to all, and always ready to offer its services in the way of mediation. I do not think the statement of Polybius, commonly understood as implying formal relations with Rome as early as 304 B.C., is to be so interpreted.[1]

Rhodes was now regarded as the centre of maritime trade. Foreign merchants came to settle there, and young men were sent there, as they now are to Hamburg or Bremen, to learn business. Men now knew the value of commercial credit, and the keeping up of commercial obligations even in the case of war, or when a son succeeded to his father's debts.

If we are in complete ignorance of the details of Rhodian commerce, we have a good deal of indirect information about their art. We are told that the metal of Demetrius's siege-engines was employed or sold to make a great statue of Helios, known as the Colossus of Rhodes, and counted among the wonders of the world. The artificer was Chares of Lindus (a pupil of Lysippus), who developed, or perhaps exaggerated, the tendency to produce effect by huge proportions, which we first find at this epoch. I spoke above (p. 121) of the wild proposal to turn Mount Athos into a portrait-statue of Alexander. The Colossus was only 105 feet high,

[1] Polybius xxx. 5, § 6 *οὕτω γὰρ ἦν πραγματικὸν τὸ πολίτευμα τῶν Ῥοδίων ὡς σχεδὸν ἔτη μ΄ πρὸς τοῖς ρ΄ κεκοινωνηκὼς ὁ δῆμος Ῥωμαίοις τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων καὶ καλλίστων ἔργων οὐκ ἐπεποίητο πρὸς αὐτοὺς συμμαχίαν.* This seems to me only to mean that though Rhodes had since 304 attained, like Rome, the position of a first-class power, and so had come into various contact with Roman traders, no formal alliance had ever been made.

and did not stand across the harbour or act as a lighthouse, but was placed somewhere on the shore, near the harbour. We are told that there were many other colossal statues at Rhodes, which would have been very notable, had they not been surpassed by this work. Unfortunately it was overthrown, some sixty years after its erection, by the earthquake which brings Rhodes into European notice about 227 B.C.; and so the twelve years' labour of Chares and the 300 talents spent upon it turned out a boastful but brief investment. For in consequence of an oracle,[1] which no doubt considered the loss of life and property caused by its fall, it was left lying on the shore, where Pliny saw it 250 years later, and comments upon its appearance. 'Even lying on the ground it is astonishing. Few men are able to make their hands meet round its thumb, each finger is larger than most statues, great caverns yawn into the interior of the limbs, and within you see gigantic rocks, by whose weight the artist had steadied his statue.' It was cast in blocks, which were set up one over the other, and which therefore show how perfectly he must have understood the proportions of the human figure, according to the fixed and scientific canon established by Lysippus. It is, of course, ludicrous to repeat that such an artist made the mistake of asking double the price when the state asked him to double the size of his proposed figure, and so became bankrupt and committed suicide. Yet this is the kind of story we find in our authorities.[2]

This, then, and the other colossi at Rhodes, show a desire in the rich merchants to outdo other cities in the magnificence of their public monuments. Unfortunately we have none of

[1] We probably have its words in the proverb *μὴ κινεῖν εἰ κείμενον κακόν*.

[2] Sext. Empir. *adv. Math.* vii. 107, quoted in Overbeck's *Schriftquellen* No. 1545. Philo of Byzantium, ranking it as the fourth of the seven wonders of the world, gives a full description, cf. *SQ* 1547.

them remaining. A large number of artists' signatures on bases have been recovered, from which we learn that many of these bronze statues were portraits, as we might expect, from the school of Lysippus; while the constant mention of adoption[1] suggests some custom which either compelled or induced strange artists settling at Rhodes to become Rhodian citizens.

In contrast to the novelty and marvel of size which Chares attained in his statue of the Sun, we have extant two works of great fame, which show brilliant success in another direction, that of exceeding all previous sculptors in the complication and variety of an elaborate group. There are now at Rome and Naples two famous groups, the Laocoon and the so-called Toro Farnese, of which the former, in the opinion of Pliny, who describes it, and in the opinion of the earlier modern art-critics, stands alone in its perfection. The general public has also gained an interest in it, because it represents a scene described in the most splendid and widely read of Latin poems, the *Aeneid* of Virgil. Though the three sculptors who designed and executed the work jointly or in committee, as Pliny says, probably did not conceive the catastrophe exactly as Virgil did, the agony in the poem and in the marble is the same, and it is this moment which the Rhodian artists ventured to represent, thus abandoning the monumental and ethical traditions of sculpture, and pursuing a new scope—the representation of the extremest emotions at their climax. The analogy to the Pergamene sculpture noticed above is obvious, but here we have a mastery of design and of detail which far exceeds even the great reliefs on the high altar. The Laocoon is intended to be nothing more than a relief brought forward from a niche. It is not intended for any but a front view, nor does it even, as Goethe felt, require a long inspection. There are indeed

[1] In the form Ἀθανύδωρος Ἀγησάνδρου κατ' ὑοθεσίαν δὲ Διονυσίου.

three distinct stages of human suffering portrayed. The younger boy is just dying of the poison, and has passed the full bitterness of pain; the elder boy is as yet untouched, except by the aspect of his father, and the coil of the snake. Laocoon himself is in the very climax of his agony, already helpless to act, but unimpaired in feeling, and this figure it is which will always rivet the attention of the spectator.

I will not enter into the long controversies about this celebrated work, as to its real age, its originality, its history, which now amount to a vast literature. Adopting the view that what we possess is the original work of Rhodian artists of the period now before us, expressing a legend treated in tragedy by Sophocles, and afterwards freely adapted by Virgil, I think it an important evidence of the vigour and originality of art at Rhodes to find these sculptors exceeding all that had gone before, and in the only way possible—by intensity of expression, elaborateness of finish, and complexity of design. Whether this be indeed an advance may be doubted. Recent critics are perhaps too adverse to the Laocoon, as the older had been too favourable. To me it always seems that the execution fails in making the two boys *little men*—a defect which I do not see noticed by the art critics. But no one will ever deny that for pathos the work has hardly a rival.[1]

The *Toro Farnese* represents Zethus and Amphion tying Dirke to the horns of a wild bull, while their mother Antiope, whom Dirke had ordered them to punish in this very way, and whom they had only then discovered to be their mother, is standing by.[2] The prolonged cruelties of Dirke to her sister-in-law Antiope, whom she had made her

[1] Cf. the elaborate discussion of the whole matter in Overbeck *Gesch. der griech. Plastik* ii. 262-302, and now that of Kekulé in the English Baedeker's *Greece* p. cix.

[2] It was the memory of this group which revealed to me that I had found a fragment of the lost *Antiope* of Euripides among the Petrie Papyri.

slave, justified, in Greek sentiment, this shocking requital. But the sculptors had only before them the moment—the struggle of the strong young men with the bull, the despair and agony of Dirke—and the whole composition is so designed as to *require* inspection from every side—in this superior to the Laocoon, while perhaps inferior to it in the over-importance and weight of the upper part.[1] Here too the influence of painting on the sculpture of the day is manifest, especially in the carefully worked accessories. The artists' names, Apollonius and Tauriskos of Tralles, are given by Pliny; but that they executed the work at Rhodes, from whence it came to Rome to the palace of Asinius Pollio, is also certain.

What must have been the aspect of Rhodes when it was full of these noble works! We know that for painting it was not less celebrated. I have already mentioned Protogenes and his famous pictures (p. 117).

The description in Lucian of the marriage of Alexander and Roxane by Aetion, which the painter exhibited at Olympia, gives us a further notion of the kind of work which was admired, and a fresh example how completely the Anacreontic cupids, with their sportive attributes, had taken possession of all kinds of art. 'What marvel was there in his picture,' asked some one, 'that the Elean umpire (at the Olympian games) should marry his daughter to an artist, who was a stranger? The picture is now in Italy, and I have seen it, so that I can tell you. There is a very fair chamber, and in it the nuptial couch, and Roxane, a maiden of great beauty, is sitting with eyes fixed on the ground in modesty before Alexander, who is standing. But there are laughing cupids, one of whom is drawing the veil from the bride's head and showing her to the bridegroom; while another, like a servant, is untying his sandals; and a third, taking hold of his tunic,

[1] Overbeck *op. cit.* 310.

is drawing him as hard as he can towards Roxane. The king himself is handing a garland to the maiden, and his bridesman, Hephaestion, is by with a lighted torch, leaning on a very beautiful boy—I suppose Hymenaeus, for the name is not written over him. In another part of the picture other cupids are playing with the arms of Alexander, two of them carrying his spear in imitation of men carrying a heavy beam of wood; while two others are drawing along a third seated on the shield; another has got inside the corselet, which is on the ground, and is preparing to frighten the others when they come up to him dragging the shield.'[1]

Rhodes therefore represents to us, as much as Alexandria, and in a different way, what I may call the modernness of Hellenism. Whatever jealousies and frictions Rhodes afterwards had with Pergamum, these cities seem very closely allied in this respect. In rhetoric, indeed, later critics remarked a clear difference between the Asianic and the Rhodian style, the latter, which professed to be derived from Aeschines, being much purer, chaster, and nearer to Atticism in taste. This we should naturally expect from the older and purer origin of the city, from the better traditions of spoken Greek which it must have possessed, and from that Doric staidness which long remained a feature of its population. Alexandrian poets, such as Apollonius and Theocritus, resided there and at Cos, possibly to study purity of diction among a really Hellenic population. These considerations justify us in calling this city the eastern Athens of Hellenism.

But there was one feature in which it outshone Athens completely. I do not allude to the formation of a league of free cities far different from the maritime empire of

[1] Overbeck *Schriftquellen* No. 1938. Lucian goes on to describe the obvious allegory in all this, and even to apply it to the painter's own fortunate marriage which arose from it. Cf. above, p. 218, note, on the very analogous *Calumny* of Apelles.

Athens, with its oppression and its discontent. The fashion of leagues or confederations among small states was then very prevalent, and close to the Rhodians there existed one of the most curious and well developed, the Lycian League described by Strabo, on which Professor Freeman has commented with such ability.[1] I allude rather to the practice of international arbitration, of which a so far solitary case will probably come to be regarded as the highest point in the politics of our nineteenth century.[2]

A remarkable crisis in the history of Rhodes gives us very curious evidence on the position she had attained as a neutral commercial power. The new city had already been visited with disastrous waterspouts. The form of the surrounding hills, which enclosed it like a theatre, caused sudden heavy rains to gather into torrents, and rush together down the slopes into the streets. This had happened when the city was new and only partly inhabited, and again twice later, the third flood doing great mischief, drowning no less than 500 people, who had not time to escape to roofs or high points, and threatening to tear down whole streets, which were fortunately built of stone, not of bricks, so that they resisted till part of the lower wall near the harbour gave way and let the water rush into the sea. We hear that there were special drains or outlets to meet this contingency, but that summer having set in, people became negligent, and allowed them to become stopped.[3]

But even this flood was a small matter to the catastrophe that happened about the year 225 B.C.[4] An earthquake over-

[1] *Hist. of Federal Government* new ed. pp. 162 *sq.*

[2] The Geneva arbitration between America and England on the Alabama question.

[3] Diod. xix. 45. It happened about the year 315 B.C.

[4] The authorities vary from 227 to 222 B.C.; as Seleucus Callinicus was still alive, it appears to have been near the former date. On the

threw almost all the docks and public buildings, as well as the Colossus, which broke off below the knees, and probably killed a vast number of people, though that fact is not specified. The Rhodians forthwith sent out embassies over the world to tell their misfortune and claim help, nay, they managed so well, says Polybius, that their misfortune was more than made good to them, and turned out rather a success. They, moreover, accepted the gigantic gifts of all the friendly powers rather as due to them than as favours, and greatly increased their reputation throughout the world. The list of contributions given by Polybius, which, he says, is by no means exhaustive, amounts to at least 600 talents of silver (£145,800); and the quantities of copper, lead, timber, tar, tow, wheat, ships, artillery, which were presented would certainly bring the amount to a million of our money. I give the text of Polybius (v. 88 *sq.*) from Mr. Shuckburgh's translation.

At the same period the earthquake occurred at Rhodes which overthrew the great Colossus and the larger part of the walls and dockyards. But the adroit policy of the Rhodians converted this misfortune into an opportunity; and under their skilful management, instead of adding to their embarrassments, it became the means of restoring their prosperity. So decisive in human affairs, public or private, is the difference between incapacity and good sense, between idle indifference and a close attention to business. Good fortune only damages the one, while disaster is but a means of recovery to the other. This was illustrated by the manner in which the Rhodians turned the misfortune that befell them to account. They enhanced its magnitude and importance: by the prominence which they gave it, and the serious tone in which they spoke of it, as well by the mouth of their ambassadors as in the intercourse of private life, they created such an effect upon other states, and especially upon the feelings of the kings, that

other hand, the place in which the narrative of Polybius comes in the best editions puts it a little before the battle of Raphia, so that many historians are disposed to date it early in the reign of Philopator, viz. 222 B.C.

they were not only overwhelmed with presents, but made the donors feel actually obliged for their acceptance of them. Hiero and Gelo, for instance, presented them with seventy-five talents of silver, part at once and the rest at a very short interval, as a contribution towards the expenses of the gymnasium; gave them for religious purposes silver cauldrons and their stands, and water vessels: and in addition to this ten talents for their sacrifices, and ten more to compensate individual citizens; their intention being that the whole present should amount to a hundred talents.[1] Not only so, but they gave immunity from customs to Rhodian merchants coming to their ports; and presented them besides with fifty catapults of three cubits' length. In spite too of these large gifts, they regarded themselves as under an obligation to the Rhodians; and accordingly erected statues in the market-place of Rhodes, representing the community of Rhodes crowned by that of Syracuse.

Then too Ptolemy offered them three hundred talents of silver, a million medimni of corn, ship timber for ten quinqueremes and ten triremes consisting of forty thousand cubits of squared pine planking, a thousand talents of bronze coinage, 180 thousand pounds of tow, three thousand pieces of sail-cloth, three thousand talents for the repair of the Colossus, a hundred master-builders with three hundred and fifty workmen, and fourteen talents yearly to pay their wages. Besides this he gave twelve thousand medimni of corn for their public games and sacrifices, and twenty thousand medimni for victualling ten triremes. The greater part of these goods were delivered at once, as well as a third of the whole of the money named. In a similar spirit Antigonus [Doson] offered ten thousand timbers, varying from sixteen to eight cubits in length, to be used as purlins, five thousand rafters seven cubits long, a hundred and eighty thousand pounds of iron, sixty thousand pounds of pitch, a thousand amphorae of the same unboiled, and besides all this a hundred talents of silver. His queen Chryseis also gave a hundred thousand medimni of corn, and a hundred and eighty thousand pounds of lead. Again Seleucus, father of Antiochus, besides granting freedom from imposts to all Rhodians sailing to his dominions, and besides giving ten quinqueremes fully equipped, and two hundred thousand

[1] Polybius therefore reckons the value of the λέβητες and ὑδρίαι as five talents.

medimni of corn, gave also ten thousand cubits of timber, and sixty thousand pounds of resin and hair. Nor were Prusias and Mithridates far behind these in liberality; nor the princes Lysanias, Olympichus, and Limnaeus, who were at that time in power in different parts of Asia. And as for states that according to their several abilities contributed to their assistance, it would be difficult to reckon their number. In fact, though when we regard the time which it took the city to recover its populousness, and the state of desolation from which it started, we cannot fail to be struck at the rapidity and the extent of its improvement in regard both to private and public wealth; yet when we contemplate the natural advantages of its site, and the contributions from outside which served to raise its fortunes to their original height, this feeling must give way to a conviction that the advance was somewhat less than might have been expected.

My object in giving these details is twofold. I wished to exhibit the brilliant conduct of their public affairs by the Rhodians, for indeed they deserve both to be commended and imitated, and I wished also to point out the insignificance of the gifts bestowed by the kings of our own day, and received by nations and states; that these monarchs may not imagine that by the expenditure of four or five talents they are doing anything so very great, or expect to receive at the hands of the Greeks the honour enjoyed by former kings; and that states, on the other hand, when they see before their eyes the magnitude of the presents formerly bestowed, may not nowadays, in return for insignificant and paltry benefactions, blindly bestow their most ample and splendid honours; but may use that discrimination in apportioning their favours to desert, in which Greeks excel the rest of the world.

There are several curious points brought out by Droysen in his discussion of this passage, in addition to the remark of Polybius that no such gifts could be obtained from kings or states in his own day, some eighty years later. In the first place, the world must have been very prosperous to afford such large benevolences. But this wealth was chiefly obtained by commerce, and of this commerce Rhodes was

clearly the centre. It is plain from the quantity of silver and even of coined copper that there was no developed system of credit on paper or of state-loans. To meet her obligations Rhodes must actually have ready money.

In the next place, a great deal of the gifts in kind was directly intended to supply the city with efficient ships. Supposing that the ships in the docks had been destroyed, this can only mean that the Rhodian navy was still keeping the pirates in check, and was necessary to the safety of all trade in the Mediterranean. This is no doubt the meaning of their ships going out regularly in threes.[1] Other contributions were specially to be applied to oil and the further wants of the gymnasia, or to public feasts and processions, showing, I think, that, in addition to the young men who were sent there to learn business, many idle inhabitants of other capitals sojourned at Rhodes, and enjoyed the festivities and luxuries of the city. But far more important is the clear danger of a financial crisis all over the world in case of the bankruptcy of the great trading state. It must have been a particularly safe place for depositing money, and therefore the great banking centre of the world. Each foreign state was, therefore, only protecting its own finances in preventing a panic and the closing of the Rhodian banks.

This, however, by no means exhausts the matter. The Rhodians had for a century back been the acknowledged arbitrators and peacemakers among the nations, and if they had often failed they had often succeeded, and had been found thoroughly just and trustworthy in their advice and their decisions. We probably do not know a tithe of the

[1] C. Torr *Rhodes* p. 47. We have also a Delian inscription in which the islanders thank the Rhodian Epicrates for keeping the sea quiet—about 200 B.C. Cf. *BCH* x. 112. He was αποσταλεις υπο του δημου των Ροδιων, and called αρχων επι των νησων.

cases, arbitration being an old fashion among Greek states, so much so that it was usually considered decent when threatening war to offer a settlement by referring the dispute to a neutral power. Such cases go back to the sixth century B.C. In Polybius, for example, a little later than the time of the earthquake, we have (v. 63) Ptolemy Philopator's ministers soliciting the mediation of Rhodes, Byzantium and Cyzicus, to settle his dispute with Antiochus III. We learn from an inscription[1] that an old quarrel between Samos and Priene, which had been referred to King Lysimachus, and then to Antiochus II. (Theos), who sent special envoys to examine into it, was finally referred to the Rhodians, probably about 250 B.C., who in the inscription refer to the previous arbitrations, and decide in favour of Priene.[2] In the days of Philip V., when we have better information through Polybius, there seems to be no war where envoys from the free cities, especially seaport towns, with Rhodes at their head, do not appear in the rival camps and strive to make peace. It was this acknowledged office of Rhodes which was taken advantage of by the infamous Q. Marcius, when he induced the islanders to offer their mediation between Rome and Perseus, and caused them to offend the senate so mortally as to bring about their ruin.

[1] *CIG* ii. No. 2905, cited by Droysen. On the whole question of arbitration in international disputes by external judges, selected by the disputants, cf. the careful Dissert. of E. Sonne *de arbitris externis* etc., Göttingen, 1888.

[2] See also the case in Plutarch's *Aratus* c. 23 of that person making an attack on Argos in time of peace; consequently Aristippus, the tyrant of the place, cites the Achaean League, whom Aratus represented, before the arbitration of the city of Mantinea, who condemn the League to a fine of thirty minae. So the Locrians of Opus refer to the arbitration of King Antigonus the assessment of the tribute they are forced to pay to the Aetolians. Cf. on these cases Droysen's *Hellenismus* iii. 441, 447.

This, then, was another, and, if I mistake not, a capital reason for the goodwill and gratitude of all the civilised world, and the determination to support the prosperity of Rhodes. I know nothing that shows us more clearly the advance of Hellenism upon Hellenedom in the solidarity of nations. Had such a catastrophe happened to imperial Athens, or Syracuse, or Tarentum, we should have heard of nothing like this unity of spirit in actively supporting and restoring any of them. Friendly sentiments would have been expressed—talk about the 'eye of Greece,' about the desolation of ancient shrines, and the destruction of Hellenic homes—but no lavishing of money, no free admission to ports, no feeling that, apart from sentiment, a real calamity had fallen upon every city joining in the trade of the world.

This is perhaps the best place to notice an important event bearing upon the same aspect of Hellenism,—I mean the war of the Bithynian succession.[1] Nicomedes I., having founded his brilliant capital Nicomedia in the usual manner, and introduced the general principles and habits of Hellenistic civilisation, died (about 262 B.C.), leaving two families of children, the first grown up, the second infants, but declared, through the influence of their mother with the old king, heirs to the throne, to the exclusion of the elder family. In order to carry out this testament, what guardians did Nicomedes appoint? The kings of Macedonia and Egypt, and the cities Byzantium, Heraclea, and Kios—in other words, the adjoining Hellenic free cities, and the two great powers which were in mutual opposition, but had no direct interest, like Syria, in gaining territory in Bithynia. It appears that troops from all the five powers garrisoned Nicomedia. Nevertheless the ingenious device of the old king failed. The eldest son, Ziaëlas, invaded Bithynia with an army of

[1] Memnon, frag. 24 in *FHG* iii. 357.

Galatians, also no doubt with the support of Antiochus II. of Syria, and though the Bithynians raised an army to support the king's will and the claims of the young step-brother, Tiboetes, Heraclea agreed to an arrangement by which the elder prince succeeded, and Antigonus, who evidently opposed this settlement, received the younger as an exile at his court in Macedonia. We have, then, a king on the outskirts of Hellenism so understanding the political relations of the world that he trusts to diplomatic rivalries, and to the anxiety for the balance of power in neighbouring kings and states, as the best security to establish his chosen heir.

Rhodes was not drawn into this affair. As I said before, the northern or Euxine cities were not in her league, and, as we shall presently see, Byzantium had very opposed interests. We hear, indeed, from this period an account of the Byzantine people strongly contrasted with what we know of Rhodes. It is asserted that, though in constant dread of their Thracian neighbours, and only defending themselves against them by high walls and heavy payments, they treated their subjects on the Asiatic side as helots, while they themselves lived a drunken and luxurious life, chiefly, we are told by Athenaeus,[1] in pothouses, so that a general who was put to great straits to make them man the walls had these establishments set up close inside the fortifications.[2] I cannot, however, believe such things of a great trading settlement which maintained its prosperity all through history, and at this very period could hardly have continued to exist without a great deal of vigour and ability in its leading citizens.

[1] x. 442. From Phylarchus.

[2] I remember the late Sir H. Lake, when talking about his defence of Kars with General Williams, mentioning the same habits in the Turkish officers, and how he had to go round the pothouses with a picket and turn out these officers when he saw or suspected a Russian attack in preparation.

The account given by Polybius of its commercial war with Rhodes (219 B.C.) is so interesting, and so closely connected with the *solidarity* of Hellenistic trade, as I venture to call it, that it will naturally find its place here, and suitably close our chapter.

The Rhodians had just shown their sympathy for the Euxine cities by receiving an embassy from Sinope, now in danger of investment by sea and land from Mithradates. This king had been among the recent benefactors of Rhodes, and perhaps for this reason, as well as from their general policy, they sent no ships to aid Sinope, but appointed three commissioners, to whom they entrusted 140,000 drachmas (about £5000) for the purchase of supplies for its defence. They bought wine, horse-hair, gut-strings, armour, catapults, etc., which they brought to Sinope. Why had the Sinopeans not applied to Heraclea or Byzantium for aid? In the latter case at least we can furnish a reply.

'The Byzantines,' Polybius tells us,[1] 'dwell in a place provided with the greatest possible advantages for safety and wealth by sea, but not so by land. For they are complete masters of the entrance into the Euxine, so that none can sail in or out without their leave. Whatever, then, the Euxine affords the people of Byzantium can command. Now as regards the *necessaries* of life, as to cattle and slaves, the Pontic regions supply them of the most abundant and excellent quality. As regards *luxuries*, they send us plenty of honey, wax, and salt-fish. They import from the south oil and wine. As to corn, it varies, sometimes they export, sometimes they import. It follows that the Greek world must either be deprived of all this, or that the trade in them must become completely unprofitable, should the

[1] iv. 38, which I somewhat abridge.

Byzantines either surrender and join with the Galatae and the Thracians, or else give up their settlement. For, when the straits are so narrow, and the barbarians on its shores so many, the Euxine must then be completely lost to us. The Byzantines, however, themselves gain most of all by the peculiarity of their position, importing and exporting all they like without trouble or danger; they, not the less, confer great benefits on others. Being therefore, as it were, common benefactors, they should naturally receive not only thanks, but public assistance from the Greek world, as regards their dangers from the surrounding barbarians.'

'But as the peculiarities of the region are not generally known, on account of its being a little out of the beaten track of visitors,' he goes on to give a geographical description, together with a theory to account for the current out of the Black Sea, which he thinks will in the end become sweet water, and be filled up with the deposit of the great rivers which flow into it. 'For this is the peculiarity of the present age'—he wrote about 150 B.C.—'that, as every land and sea has been traversed, it will no longer do to trust poets and mythographers about strange things, as most of our forefathers have done.' He then proceeds to discuss[1] the course of the currents in the Bosporus, showing that Byzantium is placed in the right spot, towards which the current sets from Chrysopolis on the other side, higher up the strait; while Chalcedon is in the wrong place, and if its people want to cross to Byzantium they must ascend to Chrysopolis. This was the place, accordingly, which Alcibiades had advised the Athenians to seize, and stop the vessels coming from the Black Sea before they reached Byzantium. Below these cities also the European coast

[1] iv. 43, 44.

is easy to follow and is direct, while the Asiatic is inconvenient and circuitous.

'But all these advantages are well-nigh lost to the Byzantines through their disadvantages on land, for, being surrounded by Thracians, they have to sustain a perpetual war with them, which they cannot settle by any single campaign, however victorious, on account of the vast numbers of the barbarians, and the variety of their chiefs and tribes. Nor can they do better by yielding and paying tribute, for if they pay blackmail to one, this brings ever so many more upon them. Thus they are afflicted with an eternal and hopeless struggle against their barbarous neighbours. They are, moreover, tantalised by seeing the rich crops which they can grow in the excellent land around them either destroyed or carried away as soon as the harvest approaches.'

I have given this extract at some length, because it represents the general condition of all those cities which had not advanced to the Hellenistic condition of drawing in and amalgamating the surrounding population, but which remained essentially Hellenic, as opposed to the barbarians. Dion Chrysostom, three centuries later, gives a very similar picture[1] of Borysthenes, an outlying Greek settlement on the north coast of the Black Sea. There too Hellenic customs and Hellenic taste had kept themselves distinct and indeed tolerably pure, but the fields were cultivated by armed men, and not a day passed without alarms of a Scythian raid.[2] Similar was the condition of the once flourishing cities of Magna Graecia at this very time. They were gradually being worn out, and were decaying, through the perpetual worry of Lucanian and Samnite invasions. To civilise the foreign nations of the north

[1] ii. 48 (ed. Teubner).

[2] Cf. my *Greek World under Roman Sway* chap. xii. pp. 273 *sq.*

and west was, however, a very different problem from that solved by Alexander. For, though the Greeks spoke of all foreigners as barbarians, they encountered in the south and east both a culture older and in some respects higher than their own, and many populations accustomed to peace and industry. The real conquests of Hellenism, as of early Christianity, were among nations who had reached a certain stage of culture.

Let us now return from this digression to the narrative of Polybius.[1] 'Nevertheless, being accustomed to the Thracian war, they observed their original relations of fairness to the Greeks (in charging no dues), but when the Galatians supervened, and, having been repulsed from Delphi, came to the Hellespont, and, instead of passing over into Asia, settled round about Byzantium, and set up a sovranty at Tylis, then the wretched Byzantines had to pay 3000, 4000, nay up to 10,000 gold pieces, to save their territory from devastation, and at last were forced to subscribe annually eighty talents (£20,000), till the moment in question, when the Galatian king, Kauaros, was driven out, and the Galatians either exterminated or expelled by the Thracians, who were now in their turn victorious.'

I suppose the people of Byzantium thought this change of neighbours a suitable moment to make some better terms with the Thracians, and, moreover, they must have been greatly encouraged by the late appeal of the Rhodians to the civilised world, and its success. It is hardly possible that they had refused to help on this occasion, unless indeed their bad character and the heavy expenses just related offered them a good excuse, of which they soon had to repent. 'Being now pressed sore by their tribute, they first sent round embassies to the Greeks, praying for help and a

[1] iv. 46.

contribution in their difficulties.' But they did not receive any response such as was made to Rhodes. No doubt chronic misfortunes do not affect men's minds like a sudden catastrophe. Moreover, the Byzantines had no public character like the Rhodians, who were personally respected everywhere. We may add that, Byzantium being 'a little out of the way,' as Polybius says, was not in the thoroughfare of nations and therefore by no means so important to the finance of the world. It was certainly not the locus for banks or deposits. I think too we may assume in the Byzantium of this day some jealousy of Rhodes, and a desire to be independent, which may have come out more clearly than historians tell us when the earthquake prostrated her southern rival.

At all events 'when most of the cities disregarded their appeal, they felt themselves obliged to detain and levy money from Greek vessels entering the Black Sea. So when great loss and inconvenience arose to all the trading world from the toll levied by the Byzantines upon exports from the Euxine, everybody was disgusted, and all the traders laid the blame upon (or called in) the Rhodians, because they were considered the premier state in matters of shipping.'

Nothing can be more modern than all this. We could imagine an exactly similar case arising as regards the Suez Canal, if England had not her own special interests in India to protect. We can imagine some Mahdi or Arabi stopping the free passage of the canal, and the states of Europe coming to England and saying: You are the principal naval power of the world; you must put a stop to this inconvenience. 'So the Rhodians, urged to action as well by their own loss as that of their neighbours, first sent embassies along with their allies, demanding that the

Byzantines should desist from their toll. But the Byzantines argued the case and would not give in, considering that their own chief men had the best of the discussion. So the Rhodians went home and declared war.'

The method of carrying it on was not less characteristic of the age. Each sought out allies—the Byzantines sending to Attalus and Achaeus, the Rhodians to Prusias of Bithynia. Now Attalus was at this time at war with Achaeus, and shut up in his capital. Achaeus, the uncle of the new king of Syria, Antiochus III., afterwards the Great, had begun by acting as satrap of Asia Minor for the young king, but had gradually become so powerful that he was induced to assume the purple, and was now the most powerful ruler in all Asia. Yet both these kings, though natural enemies, were ready to help the Byzantines. The Rhodians, however, checkmated their opponents by diplomacy; they did not care about Attalus, but they bought off Achaeus by going to Egypt and persuading the king to give them up Achaeus's father, Andromachus, who was a prisoner there, and kept as a valuable hostage to serve in Egyptian diplomacy. Nevertheless the Rhodians prevailed with Ptolemy, and by sending home Andromachus, conciliated Achaeus, on whom the Byzantines had mainly depended. In addition, the Rhodians, without spending any amount of men or money, urged against them Prusias, King of Bithynia, grandson of the Nicomedes whose will was mentioned above, and who had succeeded his father Ziaëlas at Nicomedia.

Some of the reasons given by Polybius for this king's hostility to the Byzantines are rather comical, but very characteristic of the times. Of course he was alarmed at their constant efforts to mediate between Attalus and Achaeus, knowing that if these kings came to terms

Achaeus would probably attack him next. But furthermore he was grossly offended by their having voted him statues in their city, and then forgotten or deliberately neglected to set them up. They were also guilty of the slight of sending no deputation to worship at his great festival, the *Soteria*,[1] while they sent one to the analogous feast of Athene at Pergamum. The Rhodians accordingly found him nursing his anger, and he readily agreed to attack Byzantium by land, if they would support him on sea.

This excessive sensibility in a sovran on the borders of Hellenism, and anxious to assert his claims to civilisation, is instructive. Honours and statues decreed by ancient Hellenic cities were a stamp of respectability, and a new capital like Nicomedia required such acknowledgments of its king. While the Rhodians were negotiating the freedom of Andromachus, Prusias attacked the Asiatic territory of Byzantium and gained considerable advantages. Meantime the Rhodians merely blocked the straits with a few ships, while the Byzantines endeavoured to make a diversion by sending for Prusias's uncle, Tiboetes, now an exile in Macedonia, to whom the kingdom should have come by will, and by promoting his claims. But unfortunately this prince suddenly died; Achaeus refused to support them;

[1] Polyb. iv. 49. This feast was probably named after the *Soteria* at Delphi, which was established by the Aetolians to commemorate the repulse of the Gauls under Brennus (A. Müller in Hermann's *Antiqq.* iii. 2, 385). Some victory of Nicomedes over the same barbarians in Asia would give an excuse for the imitation. We may learn from an important Delphic inscription commemorating the acceptance by the Chians of a similar invitation from the Aetolians to attend the Delphic *Soteria*, how formal and ceremonious the invitation was, and how deliberate a slight the refusal of it must have been considered. Cf. the details given by M. Haussoullier in his edition of the inscription, *BCH* v. 302 *sq.* Cf. also pp. 400, 408 for parallels. The general question is discussed in P. Paris's article, *BCH* xi. 334 *sq.*

and they were sore pressed by Prusias in combination with their Thracian neighbours. So they began to seek some good pretext for getting out of the war. This arose by the mediation of the Galatian king Kauaros, for reasons which we can only guess. He probably wanted to recover his kingdom at Tylis from the Thracians, and counted on the help of Byzantium.

The terms of the peace are not less curious. The Rhodians demand no war indemnity, and take no advantage. They merely propose peace on condition that no toll shall be levied for passing the straits. What is stranger, they compel Prusias to give up all the territory and prisoners he had conquered, as well as all ships and materials of war which he had carried off from the forts on the Asiatic side of the straits. On this understanding Prusias and the Byzantines were to swear eternal peace! Here then was an armed intervention on behalf of trade interests carried on without hate or revenge, backed up by complicated diplomacy, and ceasing the moment the end was attained. The men who pursued this kind of politics were no longer Greeks but citizens of the world.

Such then was the Rhodes of the third century B.C.,[1] which we shall presently find abandoning its wise neutrality, and taking part in the struggles of the age. But we have not yet reached this point, though it was worth while to bring together the facts known about Rhodian diplomacy and commerce before turning back to study the social aspects of Greece.

[1] The most interesting case of successful Rhodian arbitration is that between Samos and Priene, of which we have much detail in the inscriptions published and explained by Mr. Hicks in *Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum* part iii. See Appendix I.

CHAPTER XVI

THE GREECE OF ARATUS AND HIS LEAGUE

We have been so long occupied with the eastern portions of the Hellenistic world that we have almost lost sight of Greece itself, which all through history, in spite of the wealth and importance of Hellenic towns beyond Greece, has ever maintained its primacy as the real source and home of the world's culture. I now propose to give a sketch of the life and manners of the Greeks in Greece through the course of the third century B.C., after the settlement effected by the repulse of the Galatians, and the establishment of Antigonus Gonatas, down to the critical time when Philip V. comes to the throne, and we find ourselves under the guidance of a great authority, Polybius, who is the main exponent of later Hellenism.

I must, however, introduce the subject by recapitulating the main political movements of the day, not in detail, but so far that the reader not learned in this intricate period may be able to follow the social developments which interest him and me in the first degree.

Antigonus Gonatas had by the Chremonidean war (262 B.C.) obtained practical control of Athens. Megara was subject to him, so was Corinth, held by his nephew Alexandros, who, however, revolted to the Achaean League when

the king suffered a great defeat from the Egyptians at Andros. But the widow of Alexandros was seduced by the promise of marriage with Antigonus's son, Demetrius (the Aetolian, afterwards Demetrius II., King of Macedon), and while the festivities were going on, the citadel was taken by the old king knocking with his stick at the acropolis gate, which was opened by the unsuspecting garrison. He made a Stoic philosopher, Persaeus, commandant of the fortress, and so seemed to have his influence over the Peloponnesus secure (245 B.C.). For the reforms of Agis were evidently too chimerical to be carried out generally, and the cities of the Peloponnesus were divided into those free or democratic cities which belonged to the League, or those under tyrants. These men were all disposed to Antigonus, seeing that Aratus was the deadly enemy of all tyrants.

Yet withal the policy of Antigonus broke down, and he lived to see the great body of the Peloponnesians combined against him. The schemes of Agis were defeated, and his party, that of the young and the poor, was discredited. Some honourable tyrants, finding their theory of controlling Greeks by a fatherly despotism illusory, surrendered their power.[1] Shortly after Antigonus had seized Corinth it was retaken by a brilliant *coup de main* of Aratus, which is described in Plutarch's *Life* (above, p. 229).

Thus the aged Antigonus, who was neither obstinate nor unpractical, felt obliged to recognise the Achaean League, which had elected Ptolemy generalissimo by sea and land,[2] and died (239 B.C.), leaving his kingdom in a critical condition to his son Demetrius II., called, for some reason since

[1] Polyb. ii. 44. This movement had begun during Antigonus's earlier years, when he was still struggling with Pyrrhus.

[2] This strange step for a free confederation in Greece was determined by the receipt of a large annual subsidy from Egypt.

forgotten, the Aetolian. The old king had no doubt intended to deal with the Achaean League, as he had done with the Aetolian, by diplomacy, but no sooner was he dead than both Leagues, though usually very hostile in interests, combined to set upon the new king of Macedonia. Demetrius was pressed by this additional difficulty that the barbarians to the north, especially the Dardanians, invaded his frontier with a new and unexpected vigour.

The young king had therefore practically to reconquer his kingdom, and proved, like most of his house, fully equal to the task. But though he was able to defeat the Leagues, and drive the Achaeans out of Northern Greece, he also used against them a new and powerful weapon destined to produce momentous results. He persuaded the Illyrians, a vigorous race of pirates dwelling on the coast of Dalmatia near Montenegro, to make expeditions and plunder the east coast of Northern Greece and Peloponnesus.[1]

The invasions of these barbarians, now under Teuta, widow of King Agron, who had died in consequence of the festivities upon the return of an Acarnanian expedition, assumed larger proportions. They undertook to plunder the inland city of Phoenice in Epirus. This development caused great terror in Greece; the fleet of the Achaean League was no match for the barks of the Illyrians; the Epirotes, since they had deposed the descendants of Pyrrhus and established a federal republic of cities, were likewise helpless. Thus Macedonia was the only power which could secure the Hellenic interests against this north-eastern barbarism, and Macedonia was engaged in fierce conflict

[1] This was first done to save the Acarnanian town of Medeon, which the Aetolians had attacked, apparently just after making peace with Macedonia (231 B.C.).

with the Dardanians, in battle with whom King Demetrius II. was slain (229 B.C.).

But a new solution had already been found. The Illyrian pirates had plundered everybody, and among the ships they had taken were Roman merchantmen. When the Roman envoys complained, Teuta explained to them that the right of piracy was claimed by her subjects, and that she could only use her personal influence, not her authority, to stop it. As is well known, the younger Coruncanius told her bluntly they would soon make her improve her customs, and was murdered in consequence on his homeward journey. So came the Roman war with Illyrium, which ended in the traitor Demetrius of Pharos, the most mischievous villain of his day, obtaining as dynast most of Teuta's kingdom, while Corcyra, Apollonia, and Dyrrhachium put themselves directly under Roman protection.

In the very year, therefore, that King Demetrius II. fell the Romans crushed the Illyrian fury, and presently sent embassies to the Aetolian and Achaean Leagues, apologising, as it were, for their interference, justifying it, and rehearsing the terms of their settlement. The Greeks responded not only by formal thanks, but by admitting the Romans to the rights and privileges of Hellenism. In contrast to other barbarians, they received at Athens and Corinth the right of access to Hellenic sanctuaries and festivals.

For the present, however, the Romans interfered no further. They had at the time no views beyond protecting the eastern coast of Italy from raids and securing the safety of their traders. Presently they saw the power of the Barcides growing in Spain, and had their attention turned to Carthage and the West. We may be sure the new king

or regent of Macedonia, Antigonus III., surnamed *Doson*,[1] perfectly understood the situation. The politics of the world were far too closely interrelated for any such considerations to escape him. He would have, from Phoenicia if not directly, accounts of the progress of Carthage; from Alexandrian traders, news of the power and policy of Rome. He knew that he was safe in that direction. But he was bound in the first instance to reconstruct the kingdom of Macedonia, which had, as usual, gone to pieces at the death of the last king.

We have no account of his wars till he interfered in Peloponnesus. Stray notices show that from the first he took his position as one of the great powers of the world. He conquered the northern barbarians, and presently the Aetolians, in such a way that this League never stirred against him, and left his hands free for action elsewhere. At the same time the extension of the League to cities of the Peloponnesus, and still more to cities of the Propontis, shows that he knew how to utilise it against his enemies. He supported Antiochus Hierax in his wars in Asia Minor, and even boldly seized Caria, far off from home, directly threatening Egypt, whose once energetic king (Euergetes I.) was growing feeble, and offered him no active resistance.

Thus he strengthened himself to recover Greece from the Achaean League. During the troubles of the last few

[1] He was son of Demetrius the Fair, and therefore first cousin to the late king, about thirty-four years old. We have no explanation of this title, the *Promiser*, vouchsafed to us. The *Etym. Mag.* only guesses. We know, however, that he distinctly assumed the title of king as tutor for Philip, the legitimate heir, who was only seven years old; that he deliberately postponed his own children, and married Philip's mother, that her eldest son might appear more clearly the heir. Perhaps his constant and honest assertion that he would give over the power to Philip when of age, being in those days disbelieved as quixotic, gave rise to the name. Holm adopts this view *GG* iv. 315.

years this league, under the active and astute guidance of Aratus, had spread over most of the Peloponnesus, and was growing in public importance and respect. The tyrants on whom the Macedonian policy depended were giving way to moderate democracies, and there was reason to expect that all Greece might possibly be combined in some such confederation. But Antigonus saw clearly what difficulties were in the way. Athens, whether from pride or principle, never joined the Achaean League. This was sure to prevent any spread of Aratus's influence to the north; but the chief rock upon which the League seemed certain to split was the rise of a democratic monarchy at Sparta under the gallant king Cleomenes III. Neither in war nor in policy was Aratus a match for this brilliant leader, who identified himself with the wants of the people, and showed that more real liberty and prosperity could be obtained under a wise single head, with full powers, than under an aristocratic council.

Aratus himself would allow no other man to lead in the Achaean League. Though professing to hate and abolish tyrants, he was himself a tyrant in temper, furious if anybody else showed power and gained popularity, and quite ready to undermine any rival by treachery, even amounting to treason against the League. He got rid of Lydiades, the former tyrant of Megalopolis, who had voluntarily surrendered his city to the Achaeans, in this way. He left him in the lurch in battle, and saw him overpowered before his eyes.

But all his chicanery and duplicity failed before the boldness and the honest enthusiasm of Cleomenes. The League fell to pieces, partly by conquest, partly by defection to the Spartan king. In the end Aratus got himself nominated uncontrolled dictator—in other words, tyrant of the remainder. Nor did his acts belie this title, of which he had professed such theatrical abhorrence. Yet even this did

not save him. He must add the meanness of a traitor, the ingratitude of a politician, to his other crimes. Betraying his country, betraying his paymaster the King of Egypt, who had long given him a salary to oppose the power of Macedon in Greece, he brought about an alliance with Antigonus which put Corinth and its citadel into the king's hands, and once more made Macedon master of Greece.

So began the famous 'Cleomenic war' of Antigonus Doson against Sparta, which the Macedonian protracted for three years, while negotiating with Ptolemy the surrender of the Egyptian ally in Greece. For when abandoned by Aratus, Egypt naturally looked to Cleomenes to maintain the anti Macedonian interests. With subsidies from Egypt, the Spartan king, a first-rate general, was dangerous, and might have been victorious. Without subsidies, he must succumb, even if victorious in a battle. Antigonus appears to have ceded Caria, in return for an undertaking on the part of Egypt to abandon Cleomenes. Thus Doson was victor without fighting, merely by protracting the campaign, and we only wonder why he risked the battle of Sellasia (221 B.C.).

That battle, however, and the flight of Cleomenes to Egypt, made the Macedonian conspicuously the master of Greece, which he ordered exactly as seemed best to him. Aratus was merely his servant, the Aetolians powerless against him, Sparta crushed, Athens of no account. The great Punic war was on the eve of breaking out, and the Romans fully occupied.

But on his hurried return to meet a new raid of Illyrians, though he defeated them easily, shouting and excitement caused him to burst a blood-vessel, and he died in the prime of his manhood and his fame. The death of this great man, who alone could have met and controlled Roman influence in the Greek peninsula, makes a real turning point

in history. In Syria and Egypt too the thrones changed hands, and Polybius very justly makes this crisis (about 221 B.C.) the opening of his great work. Here, then, we pause, and turn to the details which are our chief concern. What were the political ideas which permeated Greek society? What were the current notions of morals and of manners? What trace have we of the intellectual aspirations of the age? To these questions we must attempt what answer our scanty documents admit.

The Political Notions of the Day.—We must consider the various states of Greece as having come to a settled condition in comparison with the agitated period at the beginning of the century. The great wars for the supremacy of the world were over. The great knight-errants among both Diadochi and Epigoni had passed away. Pyrrhus of Epirus was the last of them, and Ptolemy Euergetes, when he had conquered the whole East, had not dreamt for one moment of universal sovranty. The limits of both first and second-rate powers in the Hellenistic world were pretty well determined, and though there were many wars, and many attempts of ambitious men to extend their dominion, these were as distinctly within limits as is now the case in Europe. As Germany never proposed to absorb France after the late war, but merely diminished her power by taking away boundary provinces and exacting an indemnity, so Ptolemy did not dream of absorbing Syria, though he took care to weaken her. In like manner no king would have ventured to enslave the free cities of Asia Minor, or the population of Greece, however he might desire to extend his power over them and make them contribute men and money to his wars, or promise to give no aid to his foes.

This is what I mean by saying that Greece had reached

a settled condition. No one thought of destroying Thebes, or annexing Boeotia, or making Athens the dependency of a foreign power, or annexing Arcadia or Elis. On the other hand, all these states or cities were subject to invasion and loss in the way of raid, or of passing armies, unless they provided themselves with some better protection than the hurried calling out of a citizen militia. For not only were there trained armies of mercenaries always afoot, but there was a great deal of systematic piracy, especially on the west coast of Greece, where not only the terrible Illyrians but the wild Aetolians refused to settle down to orderly life; just as in Asia Minor the Galatae were for all these years the scourge of the smaller powers. Small republics, therefore, became highly inconvenient to live in, if they were really independent, and stood isolated from their neighbours.

The political remedies for this altered condition of things were various. The little city-state must either formally put itself under the protection of a greater power, which then sent a detachment of troops and a military governor to ensure safety and order; or it must entrust this duty to one of its own citizens, who could thus hardly avoid becoming superior to the laws, and assuming what was known as tyranny; or, lastly, it could enter what was known as a System, or political combination of many small states, and purchase its security by abandoning a certain portion of its sovran powers.

The first solution was least in favour, and it was always considered a recovery of liberty when the military governor and his garrison disappeared, however moderate and well conducted he may have been. Of course the chances of such a garrison being really kept in order were small, and even where we hear of honourable governors, like those of the Macedonians at Athens and Persaeus at Corinth, there

may have been frequent outrage or petty tyranny on the part of the soldatesca, a profession idle and wanton in times of peace, and always prone to despise the civilian and disturb the regularities of citizen life.

The second solution was one of perpetual recurrence all over the Greek world, perhaps now more than ever, since monarchy had not only been proved by gigantic facts to be the most splendid kind of government, but had been recommended by the philosophers in many tracts as the most rational solution of the difficulty. Polybius specially notes that such men as Lydiades were carried away by vain theories and speculations on the excellence of government by One. Cleomenes was fortified in the same view by the counsels of Sphaerus. The theorists seem not to have observed that what was monarchy in empires was tyranny in separate cities. Such a kingdom as Macedon, or Egypt, or Syria could not possibly be controlled by a republican assembly or a system of federation. The elements were too disparate, the means of communication too slow, the necessity of military control too urgent; but these cogent reasons did not subsist in a state of ten miles square.

Moreover, the deep-rooted sentiment in these Greek cities made it impossible that such a government, called a tyranny, however just and gentle the absolute ruler might be, could remain stable and equable. Even if the great majority of citizens might acquiesce, there were enthusiasts who thought tyrannicide the highest virtue, rivals who claimed an equal right to command, disappointed suitors who ascribed their losses to the injustice of the irresponsible judge, and in no case did public sentiment brand the upsetting of this form of government as either a murder or a political crime. The recent tyrants of Sicyon were mostly

good men, says Strabo; they had raised the wealth and importance of the town by making it an acknowledged art-centre, yet they perished in succession by violence. While, therefore, many must have been persuaded that tyranny was far better than ochlocracy, and the innumerable tyrannies set up in Greek cities show how general was the feeling that it was a reasonable solution, still the bulk of conservative opinion and the whole body of literature which has survived have declared themselves against it. The tracts in favour of monarchy seem the outcome of a special moment in Hellenistic history—the earlier half of the third century—and they have perished all but a few fragments.

There remains the third and at the time most fashionable expedient, that of a combination of city-states, maintaining individual freedom with a military and political power able to withstand the larger kingdoms which threatened the independence, if not the existence, of every petty dominion. It was in the variation in the amount of central control and of separate independence that the contrasts lay among the many *systems* that sprang up in this century. There was an old and well-known form which had been long repudiated, that of a capital city like Athens or Thebes ruling dependent towns, with the right or the power of interfering in the affairs of each. The subject towns were always discontented, and always ready to break loose and join any rival power. This was no Federation, but the Empire of a city-republic, with all separate liberties sacrificed to the interests of the central power.

In most complete contrast to this Imperial idea we have the Aetolian League, which did not trouble itself about the internal arrangements of its members, which would embrace tyrants as well as republics, far-off seaports on the

Propontis[1] as well as neighbouring mountain tribes, with the mere understanding that if they paid a certain contribution (fixed by agreement or arbitration) to the central government they would receive prompt military assistance when required, and if plundered by other members, redress by an appeal at Thermus, the capital of the League.

Polybius has represented this league as a mere collection of villains, associating for plunder, with the law that every member had a right to share in booty when it was to be had, even from an allied city. His account reminds us of the grotesque proposal of Hadji Stavros in About's *Roi des Montagnes*, that by proper organisation no traveller should be able to land in Greece without paying blackmail to the associated klephts.[2] But of course it is mere nonsense to assert that all the virtues were on the side of the Achaeans, and all the vices on that of the Aetolians. The Achaeans often made alliance with them, so did the King of Macedon, and other states. Had they been mere marauders levying blackmail they would not have gained or maintained a

[1] I may here quote an inscription from Mytilene with the terms of such a treaty from *Mitth.* xi. 262 :—

> ε]δοξε τοις Αιτωλοις ποτι τους Μυτιληναιους
> τ]αν φιλιαν ταν υπαρχουσαν διαφυλασσειν και μη[θ]ε
> να αγειν των Αιτωλων μηδε των εν Αιτωλιαι πολιτευον-
> των προς Μυτιληναιους μηδαμοθεν ορμωμενον
> μητε ποτ Αμφικτυονικον μητε ποτ αλλο εγκλημα
> μηθεν. ει δε τις καρυσιαζη(ι) η αγη(ι), τα μεν ενφανεα αν[α
> πρασσειν τον στροταγον τον αει τον εναρχον οντα
> και αποδιδομεν τοις Μυτιληναιοις, των δε αφανεων
> καταδικαζονταν τους συνεδρους κατα των αγον
> των και ρυσιαζοντων ζαμιαν αν κα δοκιμαζωντι
> κυριους ειμεν. πρεσβευται Ευνομος Θηριου
> Μελεδημος Αβαντος

We now have evidence from Delphi that it was under this league. Cf. *BCH* v. 405 *sqq.*, with M. Haussoullier's explanation of the texts.

[2] Cf. Plutarch *Aratus* 6 on banditti in Greece, and the ἀρχιλῃστες.

position higher than the Illyrians, and would probably have been put down by the common action of the Hellenistic world. On the contrary, their capital was the home of art and splendour; they ranked thoroughly as Greeks; they had even stood forth as national heroes against the Galatians;[1] their arbitration was often offered and accepted by other states; we must therefore correct the estimate which has passed from Polybius into modern histories on this point.

The Aetolians, who organised mercenary service for the Hellenistic world, and were ready to supply any belligerent power from Sicily to Bactria with good officers and brave soldiers, must have shown considerable cosmopolitanism at Thermus, and thus made it a peculiar place. There must have been Indian, Persian, and Egyptian luxuries among their spoils and rewards, and many of the material refinements of the East must have found their way to the homes of the great chiefs who controlled the League by their influence, if not in formal council, at its general assemblies. They made the fortune of their state by having a large population, hardy and poor, ready to serve for pay at the opening of the Forty-five Years' war, and they remained, till the absorption of Greece in the Roman Republic, the most important confederacy in northern Hellas.

The Achaean League was a far more advanced and interesting political development, which we know fairly well through Polybius, and upon which Professor Freeman has given us a masterly volume.[2] As I am not writing a political

[1] In consequence of which they established the *Soteria* at Delphi, a feast formally accepted, as we know from inscriptions, by Athens and by Chios. Cf. *BCH* v. 300 *sq.* for these texts, and M. Haussoullier's commentary.

[2] *The History of Federal Government*, now reprinted with valuable additions by Prof. Bury (1894). There is also a monograph of M. Marcel Dubois on the Leagues.

history, I will not here repeat the details, which are still of the highest interest, especially to Swiss and American politicians, but will merely point out how a constitution apparently democratic, for every citizen of every town in the League could come and vote at the general assemblies, was turned into an aristocratic one by the fewness of these assemblies, their short duration (three days), and the arrangement that the votes went by cities. This was necessary to prevent the locus of the assembly from carrying everything, but on the other hand a dozen men, who had time and means to do it, could come from the remotest member of the League and represent a whole city.

The gradual and almost accidental growth of the League led, moreover, to grave difficulties, which were never overcome. The original members were small and obscure towns. In course of time they succeeded in attracting great cities like Corinth, and it was clearly unreasonable that little Achaean townships should count as much as these in the councils of the League, while on the other hand the original members, the mother-states of the League, felt that their own dignity and lawful precedence should not be transferred to new and doubtful members. This distinction—that of mothers and daughters of the Union—came out often when the right of secession or of independent action was mooted. It will be in the memory of many how the same distinction was felt in America, perhaps more felt than expressed. Such States as Virginia, which had originally come together voluntarily into the Union, felt that they possessed quite a different right to secede from the right of California or other States which had been created as new centres of life by the Union as their mother.

But it was the assertion of independent action in external affairs, engrained in the autonomic instincts of the Greek

people, which was quite destructive to any real league, and which ultimately sapped the Achaean power. Another flaw in this league was its military weakness. It was not able to keep up a mercenary force without those constant subsidies from Egypt, which Aratus secured. But its principle was to have a citizen militia, and without such a general as Cleomenes or Philopoemen, which Aratus was not, a citizen militia was quite unable to cope with a professional army. Aratus was as weak in the field as he was strong in surprises; as helpless in large policy as he was resourceful in all the wiles of diplomacy. His great and continuous influence was directed, first of all, to keep down personal rivals, next to keep down all exponents of a democratic policy; for Aratus represented the rich and the conservative part of the population, at a time when socialistic doctrines were abroad, and the land question was constantly threatening the wealthy.

This movement, long since visible among the democracies of low franchise, was now reinforced by the appearance of a new champion, the brilliant King of Sparta. His predecessor Agis had already shown the way; he had openly proposed communistic doctrines, the abolition of debts, the redistribution of land, and all this under the guise of Lycurgean principles. He had failed by attempting to persuade his opponents, or to overrule them by political action. Cleomenes saw, or he had learned from the Stoic firebrand who was constantly beside him, that a downright revolution was necessary; that the ephors must be, not deposed, but abolished or put to death, and the full power seized by one thorough reformer. He was undoubtedly a tyrant in the real sense, and so he was often called. But he had the inestimable sentimental advantage of being legitimate king and a Heracleid, whereas the rest were

upstarts.[1] Hence his advocacy of democratic principles, his declaration that he would support democracies and the poor if they would give him soldiers, his readiness to abolish oligarchies, and to stand forth in the perfectly novel position of a Spartan king leading the radical and socialistic democracy of the age.

The *Lives* of Aratus and of Cleomenes by Plutarch will give the general reader sufficient detail as to the position of these typical men, and I shall therefore not dilate further upon the politics of the day, but proceed to the evidence of other kinds which we have of the life of this age.[2]

[1] Cf. above, p. 318, note.

[2] Our knowledge of Cleomenes comes from partisan sources, but fortunately from both sides of a great quarrel. Polybius, no doubt using the *Memoirs* of Aratus, whom he delights to honour, is very adverse to the Spartan king, as being the great and successful opponent of the Achaean League. On the other hand, Plutarch and others have also used Phylarchus, and perhaps some other historians to whom Cleomenes was a great hero and Aratus little better than a traitor. Hence we have a pretty complete picture of this famous personage supplied us by both ardent friends and bitter enemies.

CHAPTER XVII

THE INNER LIFE OF THE PERIOD

LET us now consider what progress the serious side of life had made, the attitude of *philosophy* towards religion, and the condition of religion in serious society; then what had been done for *education* in those days; lastly the *recreations* of the time, especially dramatic affairs and public festivals, including art and artists.

When we come to compare the position of philosophy with what it was in the opening period of Hellenism,[1] we find many remarkable contrasts. The age of great new systems has gone by. There is no longer a Zeno and an Epicurus, but there are rather established schools of thinking, which declare themselves of a particular creed and undertake to preach it to the world. Along with the men who did this work, who were itinerant, and made sojourns in many cities, we have others, like Chrysippus, who systematised the doctrines of the great masters. 'No Chrysippus' (it was said), 'no Stoa.' For like the dogmatic theologians who gathered the sayings of Christ and the Apostles and made them into a system of religion, with definitions and with creeds, so Chrysippus systematised the thoughts and writings of Zeno and Cleanthes. We

[1] Above, chap. vi.

even hear (from Diogenes Laertius) of an editor of Stoic works at Pergamum, Athenodorus, who omitted what he thought inexpedient, and took strange liberties with their texts.

With Chrysippus, too, came those speculative questions which are not discussed by the great masters of practical teaching. Was it possible to attain to righteousness in some respects and fail in others? or must a man be altogether good when he once found peace? If he kept the whole law and offended in one point, was he guilty of all? Again, was conversion to philosophy a gradual thing, as Aristotle had preached, attained by good habits and moral training? or was it sudden? and did it come like a revelation in a moment? I need hardly say that the latter doctrine was then, as it now is in our religion, the popular view.[1] Men like to know and count the moments in every great event, and to assign as the efficient cause some accident which is only one link in a long and hidden chain.

Again, it was discussed by the theologians—for such I may really call them—whether falling away, whether apostasy was really possible if you had once reached the truth. On this the Stoic doctors differed. Chrysippus said yes; Cleanthes no.[2] Again, what were our duties to the lower animals? Had they claims upon our justice and mercy as sentient beings, or were they of no account, owing to the difference of their nature from ours? Does this argument apply as well to the lowest stages of humanity which differ

[1] Cf. Diogenes Laertius on the sudden conversion which produced various well-known philosophers, *e.g.* (iv. 7) Polemo, a dissolute youth, came in drunk and crowned with garlands to a lecture of Xenocrates, who went on without noticing the disturbance. He was speaking of self control (σωφροσύνη); and by his eloquence the youth was forthwith converted. There are other like cases mentioned.

[2] Diog. Laert. vii. 1, §§ 125 *sq.*

so widely from us?[1] Is political justice opportunism, or is it based on eternal principles?

These hesitations and doubts were further accentuated by the rise of a sceptical school under the celebrated Arcesilaus, who represented Plato's Academy at Athens, and whose famous successor Carneades was the most brilliant advocate of philosophical agnosticism in the middle of the second century B.C. With a subtle and inquisitive people like the Greeks, it was impossible that dogmatism should not be met by scepticism, which now, however, became more logical than that Pyrrhonism which had been dogmatic in negation, and therefore had contained its own refutation. The decreasing earnestness of life in the masses, the economic decay of the Hellenistic world, the growth of pessimism all favoured this school of scepticism, which presently becomes the most dominant amongst the keener intellects through the civilised world.

Such were the subjects discussed all over Greece in thousands of lectures and tracts, but most of all in the established schools of Athens, where men who agreed on the general principles of the philosophic life quarrelled violently over details of doctrine. But even these disputes seem to have settled down a good deal. The Epicurean was no longer a heretic, to be crushed by violent denunciation or exile, nor was the Cynic now a mere solitary mad man. The itinerant preachers of all these doctrines met and lived in peace and in mutual respect, just as Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist ministers now meet without difficulty, and can each respect the religion and the morals

[1] Diog. Laert. *loc. cit.* and x. § 150. As is well known, serious doctors of the Church of Rome still hold that the lower animals have no claim whatever to any rights from man, so that the torture of them is not strictly a sin.

of the other. This was so much the case that we hear[1] of King Antigonus Gonatas supplying ample funds for a philosophic feast (to commemorate his son Halcyoneus), at which the various schools were represented. It seems they had not the good manners to refrain from controversy at table, which Arcesilaus, for one, deprecated. He was a well-bred man, and one of those who valued previous culture; but many of those present were men of low birth and ill-breeding, as we may see in Diogenes's account of their origin. Still they were ready to meet one another, and we can hardly even say that an exception was made in the case of Epicureans or of sceptics, for whatever their heresies in doctrine, they pursued the same kind of life as the rest. Indeed, the Cynics of this time distinctly preached on a basis of scepticism and pessimism.[2] They went about, like the Franciscan monks in the Middle Ages, recommending poverty and abstinence from the pleasures of life as the real secret of liberty and of perfect independence.

There was a general desire to hear about these things, even if men did not obey the full requirements of the preacher. Respectable people liked to have such men in their cities, and thought them excellent for the youth to attend. Moreover, it was not new doctrines or heresies which were required, but a full exposition of what the great masters had said, what Zeno or Epicurus or Diogenes had thought, and we see ample evidence in the fragments of one of these Cynical preachers Teles—that every effort was made to show that his new doctrine was in harmony

[1] Diog. Laert. iv. § 41; v. § 68.

[2] Menippus of Gadara, as we know from Diog. Laert. vi. § 99, put his teaching in the shape of satire, which was the model used by Varro for the same purpose.

with the old laws of morals, as laid down in Homer and the gnomic poets. As we might expect, conversions from one sect of philosophy to another were not common or reputable, nevertheless they did occur in some notable cases.[1] I do not see that the various schools tried hard to make proselytes from one another, but rather to make converts from the world. Controversies they had, of course, but these were within the schools, and not a religious propaganda, like our public controversies with Romanism.

It is probably in connexion with the rise of the philosophical schools or colleges at Athens that we may best explain the notable changes in the higher education of the youth both at Athens and elsewhere in Greece. When I say *Colleges* of the philosophers, I mean to suggest that the various seats of learning at Athens, being the gift of founders or patrons, were well kept buildings with ornamental gardens. So that city, becoming gradually, with the loss of its political importance, a centre of education and culture, gave more and more attention to these academies, and the gardens of the Epicureans and Peripatetics became not only an agreeable and fashionable retreat for quasi-studious youth, but a frequent resort of the professional tourist and idler.[2]

These schools confined themselves to the deepest mental and moral problems. They taught religion and faith, but did not trouble themselves about the physical or aesthetical perfection of man any more than our ordinary preachers do nowadays. The Stoics even disliked a pupil below the age

[1] It was remarked that conversions were not uncommon *to* Epicureanism, but never *from* it. On this Arcesilaus remarked sarcastically ἄνδρας ἂν εὐνούχους γενέσθαι, but not τὰς γυναῖκας.

[2] Cf. above, p. 156.

of mature manhood, counting youth the time of passion, when wisdom was not attainable. Accordingly it was plain that something must be organised for young people, especially for young people of wealth and importance, whose parents desired to send them from the outer parts of Hellenism to season themselves with the true Attic salt of artistic and literary culture.

For Athens was becoming poor, and in that decaying condition when men began to look about for something 'to bring money into the country,' and to consider that inducing rich people to reside and spend was a real substitute for the productive energy which compels money to come in as a return for adequate value. When the kings and nobles of Macedon, or the dynasts of Asia Minor, were willing to send their sons to Athens, and to give large endowments by way of honorarium, it was natural that the Athenians should adapt themselves to the situation, and arrange a system to meet the new demand.

For this purpose they seem to have modified the old system of advanced education, which ordained that from the age of eighteen to twenty Athenian youths, whose parentage and qualifications were ascertained, should remain under state supervision, and do the duty of patrols (*περίπολοι*)[1] round the outlying parts and frontier forts of Attica, receiving at the same time drill in military exercises, as well as some gymnastic and literary training. These youths wore a short black mantle, as a sort of military undress, and were of special prominence in religious pomps and processions, such as that represented on the frieze of the Parthenon. Nevertheless, earlier Greek literature contains

[1] These *περίπολοι* were afterwards not ephebi but mercenaries, as the city police always had been. Aristophanes represents the policeman at Athens as a Thracian, who could hardly speak a word of Greek.

but few allusions to them, and the technical terms for such a youth, *ephebus*, and for the institution of their training, ἐφηβεία, hardly occur, I think, earlier than Xenophon. The theories of Plato presuppose the latter, as indeed was natural, for not only at Sparta but in many parts of Greece some similar arrangement had long been sanctioned.

It is, however, only from the year 330 B.C. that the inscriptions about *ephebi* begin, and from 300 B.C. onward they are very numerous.[1] Then the ephebi become everywhere an important section, and even corporation, of the citizens; there are public decrees in honour of their conduct on special occasions; they have special places in the theatre; there are extant decrees in honour of their supervisors or directors (κοσμηταί),[2] and also lists of these persons. The citizens of course predominate; out of a probable total of 240[3] (at Athens) there are not more at first than 10-20 ξένοι. But, of course, these latter were important people, and we find that on the analogy of the *trierarchy*, which obliged rich citizens to fit out a ship, and imposed this duty rather as a pecuniary burden than a naval distinction, so the duty of supplying the necessaries for the gymnasia in the way of oil, etc., was entrusted to a gymnasiarch, who might be one of the pupils themselves, if he were not one of the overseers or teachers. We find, accordingly, special thanks awarded for the performance of this burden, which

[1] The earliest we have is dated 333 B.C. Cf. *BCH* xiii. 253 and 259.

[2] Originally the σωφρονισταί had been the principal officers, and had coexisted with the κοσμηταί, who seem to have usurped their functions. Cf. *op. cit.* p. 262.

[3] This is a high total. There is evidence (Grasberger *Erziehung und Unterricht* iii. 63, 91) that the average number was about 140. The phrase ἔθνη (Gentiles) and ἔθνων τάγματα were used for the non-Athenian youths.

sometimes was undertaken by several people conjointly.[1] The gradual accession of rich strangers also produced other modifications in the old Athenian practice. Of course the duty of acting as *περίπολοι*, or frontier police to guard Attica, could not be expected from these strangers, and a good many of the old gymnastic exercises had become antiquated and out of fashion. Many of the philosophers, as well as warriors, like Alexander and Philopoemen, inveighed against spending people's time in training for athletic contests, and Chrysippus even wrote a book against them.[2] On the other hand, both citizens of Athens and strangers began to lay more stress on higher education of the mind, and in addition to the old training in the liberal arts and in literature there were now the philosophic systems, which could no longer be ignored.

To meet these altered conditions we find that the duration of the epheby was ultimately reduced from two years to one, and most of the gymnastics and military training was omitted. These had once been the chief thing; now they gradually became subordinate to the musical and literary instruction. This we know as well from other sources as from the scale of salaries given to the various teachers, according to extant inscriptions.[3] Moreover the military

[1] So masters of hounds in our day undertake heavy burdens (which are sometimes divided and managed by committees), and earn the thanks of their comrades in the sport, even when the expenses are partly defrayed by public subscriptions.

[2] Diodorus Sic. (i. 81) mentions it as the received opinion among the Egyptians. He says it was even forbidden by law to practise either *pædiatric* or *music*, for the first when practised daily produced not health, but a brief and dangerous muscular strength; music effeminated the souls of the hearers.

[3] I give the main provisions of an inscription from Teos (a town specially devoted to artistic pursuits in the way of music and the drama, possibly of later date than our period, but of the same spirit:

training itself underwent suitable changes. We have a set of ephebi thanked in an inscription[1] for having maintained at their own cost and repaired a piece of heavy artillery, and made the use and practice of it available. I cannot interpret in any other way the allusion of Festus (*sub voc.* RUTUM) to the practising of throwing up sand with a shovel. It must soon have been plain to the Greeks that earthworks resisted battering better than stone walls, and so in this respect too the ephebic training was modified. Artillery, as we know, was now of capital importance, and καταπελταφεσία, 'artillery practice,' becomes common in the enumeration of the items of military training.

It is further decreed to nominate, as soon as the gymnasiarchs are chosen, a master of the boys (παιδονόμον) not under forty years of age. But in order that all free-born boys may be educated according to the splendid bequest (34,000 drachmas) of Polythrus, there are to be chosen yearly three masters to teach boys and girls, to be paid 600, 550, and 500 drachmas respectively. Besides this, two gymnastic trainers (παιδοτρίβας) at 500 drachmas each. Besides a teacher of the cithara or player, and to the man elected 700 drachmas per annum. This person is to instruct boys both in their first and in their second (and last) years in singing and playing the cithara and lyre, but the ephebi in singing only. If there be an intercalary month, he is to be paid a corresponding proportion of his salary. The Paidonomos and gymnasiarch are to pay the fencing master, and the instructors in the use of the bow and the spear under sanction of the community. The teachers aforenamed are to instruct the ephebi and the boys appointed to learn singing, and are to be paid as follows: the teacher of shooting and darting 250 drachmas, and the fencing master 300, the latter to give lessons for at least two months. But if the teachers of language (grammar and literature) make representations that the number of pupils is excessive, the Paidonomos shall decide on the matter, and they shall carry out his decision. The examinations, which were held in the gymnasium, the teachers of language and music shall hold in the council-house (cf. Grasberger *Erziehung und Unterricht* iii. 311). The predominance of musical and literary over physical training is here perfectly clear.

[1] Grasberger *op. cit.* iii. 168, note.

It is part of the same development that we should see teaching specialised, and separate trainers appointed for each kind of exercise, bodily or mental. Then begins the same subdivision of labour which has taken place in our schools in the present century, since a number of new subjects have crept into the programme of education.[1] This point is specially noticed by Philostratus (c. 15) in his tract on gymnastics. We may also safely infer that the special aptitudes of pupils became noted and developed, though we have to search all the way down to Julian for an allusion to a sort of conservatoire of music at Alexandria, where poor boys with a good natural voice were supported and trained.[2]

This tendency was naturally strengthened by the growth of competitions, which we find even in the shape of school-examinations with prizes—that old vice of pandering not only to the ambition of children but to the vanity of elders. We hear even of examinations held to test the qualification for a post.[3] We have also the show day; the children reciting or exhibiting before the perspiring parents; nay, even prize exercises being published by being inscribed on stone. But this kind of performance, so far as we know, is of later date.

We still have to consider the private life and clubs of the university students, for so we must call the ephebi. In the first place, the system was spread all over the Hellenistic world, even as far as Massilia, a Greek town in the barbarous West. We know that Tarsus had for centuries a school of repute. M. Collignon has collected, in a special

[1] Grasberger *Erziehung und Unterricht* iii. 213.

[2] Id. *op. cit.* p. 307.

[3] Id. *op. cit.* p. 329. ἀγωνες is the word for competitive examination, ἀποδεξις for a public exhibition or speech-day, θέματα for prizes, of which there were generally a first and second, and διακωδωνιζειν for testing by examination.

tract on the traces of ephebic institutions outside Athens, the inscriptions of other towns which mention the practice.[1] He has found that from nearly sixty cities, scattered over Macedonia, Greece, the Isles, Asia Minor, Syria, to which I can now add the Fayyum in Egypt, we possess this evidence. In innumerable other cases it is mere accident which has deprived us of it. The extant details show us also a great unity of type, for even in the case of Sparta, where the details varied, and strangers, for example, were never admitted, the regulations called Lycurgean were in the main of the same complexion and designed to attain the same objects. Indeed the admission of the so-called *μόθακες* and *τρόφιμοι* to the training shows that the rule of Spartan restriction was relaxed to include the only outsiders likely to require this education.[2]

It is in this public attention to education that Polybius, the first competent observer of Greek and Roman life together, sees the great contrast between Italy and Greece. He cannot understand how so important a matter can be left to individuals with every chance of neglect and mismanagement.[3] We shall see, in due time, how far this criticism was well founded.

We must, therefore, imagine to ourselves the ephebi of every considerable Greek town at this period marked out as a special class, with a right to special places in the theatre, wearing a distinctive dress, and clearly of social importance from the unity and combination of their order. They correspond to the undergraduates of Oxford or of Trinity College, Dublin, perhaps still more to the students in such towns as Leipzig or Leiden or Edinburgh, who make themselves felt on every public occasion, and whose manners are

[1] Grasberger pp. 64, 65, and *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 415.
[2] Grasberger pp. 50, 60. [3] Cicero *de Rep.* iv. 3, 3 quotes this.

of a recognised type. They were organised within themselves too in certain clubs and associations, and had their dignities and offices, with titles copied from the high offices of state. There was a *ruler*, I suppose like the senior Prefect at Winchester, called archon at Athens, a *general*, a *king*, and so forth. Their traditional usages were called *laws* (*νόμος*), their meetings *assemblies* (*ἀγορά*), their resolutions *decrees* (*ψηφίσματα*). In the city of Pergamum we even hear of 'the council and commonwealth of the youths' (*ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος τῶν νέων*) as a separate corporation meeting in their own gymnasium.

The dates of the inscriptions recording these things are not often to be fixed with certainty, and many of them may be subsequent to the times of Aratus, which we are describing. But there can be no doubt that the type of Hellenistic education was then fixed, and that many of the details now only attested by later documents owe their origin to the first century of Hellenism.

The common club or meeting-ground of these youths was naturally the *gymnasium*, while all the appointments for athletic exercises, as well as for resting in the shade, in fact for southern out-of-door life, were provided, and it was originally in the gymnasia called the Academy, the Kynosarges, and the Lykeion, that the body of the Athenian students spent their days. Hence it was natural that those philosophers who did not, like the Stoics, despise teaching youths, should set up their schools close beside these gymnasia; and such was the case. When any foreign youth, especially a foreigner who had been enrolled as an *ephebus*, wished to substitute serious studies for the rhetoric formally included in the course, he could turn without delay into the museum or college beside the gymnasium. During the period before us these gymnasia and philosophic schools

were outside the city. But two new ephebic gymnasia had been established within the walls by the liberality of Ptolemy Philadelphus and of a condottiere named Diogenes, who was bought off from the forts of Athens by Aratus, and who left this endowment to Athens.[1] When king Philip V. presently devastated and ruined all the suburbs of Athens (200 B.C.) the intramural gymnasia became the most important, and the Ptolemaeion and Diogeneion are those usually mentioned in our inscriptions.

The great modification, however, in the whole spirit of education was, as I have already said, the altered balance between gymnastic and music (in the wide Greek sense). While in older times the perfecting of the body had been chief, now it was the mind which took the first place, and as I pointed out that the nature of military training altered with the conditions of the age, so the character of musical and literary training altered also. Formerly rhetoric had been the great thing, that is to say perfect form in speaking, as the greatest lever of power in the affairs of a democracy, where public speaking was the paramount force. Nowadays oratory, though still prized and admired, was only an ornamental accomplishment, and the philosophers, with their serious thinking and their retirement from public life, had played havoc with the pre-eminence of formal perfection in speaking. Hence we find an incredibly rapid decay of oratory, even in the city where the elders could remember the

[1] He was the military governor of Athens under king Demetrius II., and held for him Peiraeus, Munychia, Salamis, and Sunion. When that king was killed in 229 B.C., Aratus succeeded in persuading him to evacuate them for 150 talents. There was an Athenian feast ever after in his honour as a benefactor. These facts are derived from Plutarch's *Aratus*, Pausanias ii. 8, 3, and an important inscription, *CIA* ii. 379, which Kohler first explained, *Hermes* vii. 1 *sq.* The reader may also consult Droysen iii. 2, 50.

fresh traditions of Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Hypereides. The passages quoted from the Phalerean Demetrius with ecstasy by Polybius would not have passed muster as average specimens in the better ages,[1] and the next famous rhetorician, Hegesias, whom we mentioned above (p. 339), is held by good critics never to have composed a decent page of eloquence.

But if the aesthetic side of Greek education was not as of old sustained by the study of rich and brilliant oratory, perhaps this loss was to some extent compensated by the greater diffusion of theatrical and musical entertainments, which attain to quite a new and distinct position in this age. We know that the building of theatres had become common all over Greece, even in third-rate towns; there is still a curious specimen extant in the steep little theatre of Chaeronea, which could only hold a very small audience.[2] These theatres were, moreover, more generally required, since they had come to be used for the public meetings of the citizens, as appears from the instances of Syracuse and Athens. Nowhere, however, may we suppose that the theatre was confined to this political use. In all of them there were musical, dramatic, and orchestic performances held during the feasts in honour, not only of Dionysus, but of other gods. Thus at Delphi there was established by the Aetolians, in commemoration of the victory over the Galatae, a great festival called the *Soteria*, which was first held about 276 B.C.,[3] and to which artists came from distant parts of the Hellenistic world.

Inscriptions reveal to us the existence of guilds of pro-

[1] Yet he still had a high character in Cicero's judgment; cf. his *Brutus* § 285.

[2] Cf. my *Rambles and Studies in Greece* third edition, p. 228.

[3] There is a Delphian decree about it, printed with a most instructive commentary by M. Haussoullier *BCH* v. 300 *sq.*

fessionals who went about Greece to these local feasts, and performed for very high pay.[1] These people, who had once been called play-actors or singers, were now called '*artists* attached to the god Dionysus' (*οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνῖται*), and were enrolled in corporations which gave them special privileges, such as freedom from military service and from taxes, as well as from imprisonment as sureties for defaulters. Whoever violated their privileges was brought, we are told, before the officers of the Amphictyony of Delphi. We find too that they were allowed to wear gold ornaments, when this was forbidden to the citizens, and they were no doubt an ostentatious and not very respectable class, in spite of all the privileges of the laws and the favours of society. In Aristotle's *Problems* (30, 10) the question is asked: 'Why are the Dionysiac artists generally bad characters (*πονηροί*)? Is it not because they are debarred from the pursuit of wisdom by being constantly tied to their business, and because they live most of their time in extravagance, sometimes again in positive want, both of which are productive of worthlessness?'

Their corporation included a priest (of Dionysus) at the head, who still remained a performer; a treasurer; dramatic poets of new tragedies and comedies and odes; principal actors of both tragedy and comedy, who brought out the old masterpieces of Euripides and Menander; and musicians and singers of various kinds. They had *impresarios*, who managed engagements of a 'caste' for distant towns; acting managers (*ἐργολάβοι*), who arranged the performances; and even special costume-hirers (*ἱματιομίσθαι*), who supplied

[1] A troupe of comedians (including tragic actors) at Corcyra got 50 minae (about £200) for an engagement, according to an inscription (A. Müller *Buhnenalterthümer*, vol. v. of Hermann's *Antiquities* p. 400, note), and this was probably not exceptionally high pay.

the 'properties' for the stage. No great festival, except the four national ones, was thought complete without the presence of these artists, and in the end musical contests were instituted even at the Pythian and Nemean games. At the others, the chief of the troupe of artists was always a leading member of the committee of management of the festival, and the salaries paid to artists, apart from the prizes offered for the competitions, were very considerable. Thus when old Antigonus was celebrating, with great pomp, the inaugural feast of his new capital, Antigoneia on the Orontes, and heard of the invasion of Asia Minor by Lysimachus (303 B.C.), he broke up the feast, but paid the artists their honoraria, not less, says Diodorus (xx. 108), than 200 talents. We hear of Dionysia all over the Hellenistic world. It is told in Plutarch's *Life of Cleomenes* that on one of that king's campaigns he met with a company of artists crossing the Peloponnesus, and that he forthwith made arrangements with them to have a temporary stage, and dramatic entertainments for his soldiers. Artists, being non-belligerents, and allowed to pass any frontier even in war, were accordingly often employed by kings and dynasts as informal envoys, and their relations to the Hellenistic courts were manifold.[1] One association of actors called itself the *attalists*, and offered sacrifices to Eumenes II. and even to his brothers. We have in an inscription from Ptolemais, in Upper Egypt, details of a corporation of artists

[1] See the list of towns, where they are attested by inscriptions in A. Muller's *Bi knematorthuwr* p. 378, notes. The dramatic corporations of Teos and of Pergamum seem to have been rich, and endowed by large private bequests. See the curious history of the constant migration round Ephesus of the Teian corporation in Strabo p. 644, and cf. on Teos, the many decrees (from Rome, Aetolia, and several Cretan cities recognising their city and citizens as inviolate etc., *CIG* 3045 58. See Appendix I.

there also, showing how universal the fashion of such societies became. Perhaps a list of the salaries or prizes, which indicate the various ranks of actors, from an extant inscription, though of Roman times, will interest the reader. In one the tragic *protagonists* receive as prizes 2500, 600, 350 denarii,[1] the comic protagonists 1500, 500, 300. In others the Pythaules and Citharistes receive 1000 denarii, the choraules and chorocitharist 1500; the encomiograph (writer of laudatory notices!), the epic and the tragic poets, 750 each, the comic poet 500, the manager of the old comedies 350. These latter sums are salaries, the former, where three plays competed, prizes.[2]

Those who consider this body of facts, recently recovered from inscriptions, showing the high consideration in which a class of people morally and intellectually insignificant was held on account of their purveying the public with recreation, will see how modern and even senile the culture of Hellenism had become. There was still the old respect for religious forms. All the oaths of ephebi or of artists are in the name of many gods, with strange names and curious attributes.[3] The marble chair granted to the chiefs of the artists' company at the theatre of Athens—a sort of reserved pit-stall—was reserved for them as priests of Dionysus, not as players, so that neither serious philosophers nor gay men of the world were disposed to quarrel with the received New Testament, or cult of the great Hellenic gods, still less with the received Old Testament, or legendary history, which supplied all the most popular

[1] Denarii may be roughly estimated as equal to francs.

[2] Cf. A. Müller's *Buhnenalterthumer* p. 413, note.

[3] The treaty of Philip V. and Hannibal (Polyb. vii. 9) shows this lavish enumeration of gods, who are invoked to sanction the obligations undertaken by two men who probably believed in none of them.

subjects for sculpture, painting and poetry. There was even, as we have seen in our sketch of Alexandrian poetry, a growing fashion of expounding and explaining all these stories, chiefly, I suppose, on account of their close relation to classical art.

But as it was the actor and not the priest who was esteemed, so the list of salaries just quoted shows us that it was the performer and not the producer, the virtuoso and not the composer, who occupied the chief place in the favour of society. The sculptor, the play-actor, the harpist, the painter, instead of being mere honourable tradesmen, esteemed but modestly rewarded by the higher classes—such was the position of the makers of the Parthenon—became prominent celebrities, whose studios were frequented by kings, whose society was sought out by nobles and men of fashion, whose trivial life was thought the most interesting source of anecdote.[1]

It is, I think, also characteristic of the age, that painting should come into such prominence, in comparison with the sister arts.[2] In older days the dramatic poet, the sculptor, the architect, were the leading representatives of art, perhaps the sculptor less so than the others. But now we hear a great deal about painters, their early struggles to obtain recognition, their enormous profits when they succeeded, and the consequent ostentation of their lives. The practice had now long prevailed of painting on panels (πίνακες). This kind of art could command prices from

[1] The reader will find on p. 117 an anecdote from Plutarch to the point. The well-known story *ne sutor supra crepidam* (generally misquoted *ultra*) tells us of another smart rejoinder of Apelles, who seems to have posed as a wit as well as an artist. Such ambition was probably quite foreign to Pheidias or Polygnotus.

[2] What follows is a continuation of the remarks made above, pp. 117 *sq.*

many a rich patron; whereas statues, whether of bronze or marble, were difficult to move, and were, moreover, too calm and monumental for the taste of a society which affected great passions and loved exciting moments. Such a subject as the Laocoon could be better portrayed in a picture, with colours and accessory circumstances, than in marble, even with the consummate mastery of their art which the Rhodian sculptors attained. And so the reader may read in Overbeck's interesting collection[1] of the ancient notices of fashionable painters, how they sought out all manner of technical devices to reproduce not only the stormiest affections of the mind, but the bloody foam upon the champing bit, the momentary blush upon the dark cheek. Portraits also came into fashion, not only of actual men, such as that of Alexander the Great at the temple of Ephesus, which Apelles painted for twenty talents (about £4800), and Antigonus, but fancy portraits of imaginary or legendary worthies.

This Apelles, who is the real father of Hellenistic painting, painted a portrait of himself, a fact implying the use of good mirrors, without which the feat would hardly be possible. It was he, too, who invented a peculiar varnish, which not only protected the picture but toned down the colour; and other devices he expounded in a special treatise on his art.[2] I have mentioned Apelles's visit to the Ialysos of his younger rival, Protogenes. After a long pause, he said the labour was great and the result wonderful, but that it did not possess the grace by which his own paintings reached the skies. This Protogenes also painted a satyr, with so life-like a quail sitting on a pillar beside him that the

[1] *Die antiken Schriftquellen* [*SQ*] *zur Gesch. der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig, 1868).

[2] Overbeck's *SQ* Nos. 1893, 1900.

public brought real quails, which tried to attack it, and in the end Protogenes obtained leave of the custodians of the temple, for whom he had painted it,[1] to wipe out the quail, as it interfered with the appreciation of the principal figure.

These stories disclose to us a state of things like that of the Renaissance, when the priests of a church would employ a very worldly artist to paint them an altar-piece, or perhaps a rich patron would pay for such an ornament.

The demand for novelty even sent men of genius to study the vulgarities and trivialities of low life, and we have the Hellenistic 'Teniers school,' *ryparographi*, dirt-painters, as they were called, depicting barbers', tailors', and cobblers' shops, loaded asses with their vegetables for market, and the like.[2] We even come so far as to have the unfinished work of a master specially prized, because it was unfinished — a judgment we find in Pliny,[3] but no doubt echoed from Hellenistic days. The climax of this meretricious taste for vulgar detail was the work of Sosos of Pergamum, who represented in mosaic *an unswept floor*, with all the scraps and remains of a banquet lying about, such as might be seen before the room was cleaned. With these unhealthy symptoms came in the taste for gems, intaglios, embroidery, and fine pottery, all of which commanded high prices, and if this taste did not ennoble art it at least gave a great stimulus to trade.

As I have been insisting upon so many points of similarity with modern times, I will conclude this chapter with a citation from Polybius, which still shows the antique

[1] Painting such pictures for the custodians of a temple implies that it was a mere art-gallery, also that there must have been money made by showing them.

[2] *SQ* No. 1963.

[3] *SQ* No. 2122.

Greek spirit surviving as regards an important feature in education. We should expect that the more art fell into the hands of professionals, and exhibited the fact that the most perfect performer might be a villain, the more the theory of the moral influence of art would be abandoned, or lost out of sight. Such, for example, is the case nowadays. Nobody thinks of playing Beethoven or Wagner with a view to the moral improvement of the hearer. But this had been the universal belief down to Aristotle, and is insisted upon in his *Politics*, a book less visionary perhaps, and tamer in its views, than most modern works of political theory. Still Aristotle represents Hellenedom, not Hellenism, and is therefore no witness for the age after the revolution produced by Alexander. But Polybius, the sceptic, the modern man, the philo-Roman, the real Machiavelli of pre-Christian times, what does he say on the same subject?

Since therefore the Arcadian people have a very high standing among the Greeks, not only by reason of the hospitality and kindliness of their manners, but still more for their piety to the Deity, it is worth while pausing to discuss the savageness of the Cynaethans, and how they, being confessedly Arcadians, were notorious above the rest of the Greeks at this time for cruelty and lawlessness. The reason seems to me this, that they first and alone of the Arcadians abandoned what the ancients had carefully devised and planned according to nature as applying to all the inhabitants of Arcadia. For the practice of music, at least music in the true sense, is to all a benefit, but to Arcadians a positive necessity. We must not consider music, as Ephorus said in the Preface to his history, venturing a statement quite unworthy of him, to have been introduced by men for mere deceit and fascination, nor can we think that the old Cretans and Lacedaemonians introduced for no reason the pipe and rythm instead of the trumpet, nor that the early Arcadians for no reason received music into their whole public life, so far as to make the daily

practice of it compulsory not only for children, but for youths up to thirty years of age, though in other respects their habits are very severe. This is well known and familiar to all, so that perhaps only among the Arcadians boys are taught from their earliest youth according to law the hymns and paeans in which each town celebrates its local and traditional heroes and gods; after this learning the strains of Philoxenus and Timotheus, their highest ambition is to dance for the Dionysian flute-players in the theatres, boys in the boys' contests, youths in those of grown men. So also all through their life in their entertainments they prefer to provide amusement to the company themselves than to bring in professional performers, and they arrange that the company shall sing in turn. They consider too that to confess ignorance of other acquirements is not a disgrace, but a knowledge of singing they cannot deny, seeing that they are all compelled to learn it, nor can they decline to sing under these circumstances, because it is thought a breach of manners. Moreover the youths perform yearly to their own citizens in the theatres martial music, which they have practised in military array, and dances which they organise under common control by subscription. The ancients seem to me to have introduced these customs, not as a superfluity of luxury, but considering that they were all peasants on their farms, and generally how laborious and hard were the conditions of their life. They considered also the strictness of their manners, which follows naturally from the cold and harsh climate of most of their country, to which influence all of us are naturally and necessarily assimilated. It is for this and no other reason that there are national and other very wide distinctions among men in manners and appearance and complexion as well as in most of the institutions of society. Wishing then to temper or dilute what was rough and harsh in nature, they introduced the customs we have just described, and also made many common meetings and sacrifices for men and women alike, and added dances of maidens and of children, and in fact exhausted their ingenuity in striving to refine and humanise the ruggedness of the natural man by a careful training. This it was that the Cynaethans completely neglected when they too most required such assistance, as they inhabited a climate and country far the harshest in Arcadia, and so, falling into mutual disputes and jealousies, at last became so

inhuman that in no Hellenic city anywhere did there occur greater or more frequent atrocities.[1]

Let me add that Cynaetha was situated in the wild alps now known as the Chelmos range, which separate Arcadia from Achaea, where even now, when the climate is milder than of old, snow remains in many places till April or May, and that the whole of Arcadia was then the home of bears and wolves in the great forests of which there are still some remains in our day. The change from this real conception of Arcadia to the pastoral and romantic conception now suggested by the word was first traced out and explained in the twelfth chapter of my *Rambles and Studies in Greece.*

Thus—in the midst of moral scepticism, in the midst of myriad disillusions, in spite of the decay of Hellenistic glory and the rise of Roman greatness—we still have the old theory of the morality of music firmly upheld by the most advanced and unromantic thinker of the day. Does not this suggest to us strongly that we may now be overlooking subtle laws of moral progress, subtle influences permeating all our life? Is it really certain that the ear cannot learn vice or virtue through the suggestion of melody, and that moral prejudices may not be the outcome of aesthetical training?

[1] Polyb. iv. 20, 21. The same views may be read in Strabo x. 3, § 9. And yet he speaks of the Dardanians (vii. 5, § 7) as ἄγριοι τελέως, and yet very musical.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CRISIS OF HELLENISM

POLYBIUS insists again and again upon the signal moment in the world's fortunes from which he begins his formal history. He says that about the 140th Ol. (220 B.C.) all the great thrones of the world changed hands, and what was more, passed into the hands of youths under mature age. The new Ptolemy, aged, perhaps, twenty-four years, was the oldest, but certainly the most childish among them. The others, Antiochus III., Philip V., were mere lads, so was Hannibal, who succeeded to the real sovranty of Spain with such momentous consequences. Attalus and Aratus were the only established men of note in the Hellenistic world. Achaeus indeed, the uncle of Antiochus, was making himself a kingdom in Asia Minor, and was an exceedingly able man. But he was a usurper, and, as we shall presently see, could not overcome the feeling of loyalty to the Seleucid house, which had now taken full possession of the eastern parts of Alexander's empire. Polybius notices that the wars which began about this time separately in various portions of the world, and without any common cause, resulted in bringing East and West into relation, so that from henceforth the history of the Mediterranean nations follows no separate channels, but runs in one broad stream.

It is very interesting to note the characters of the boys who had such vast interests thrown into their hands; nor can we say that their youth and inexperience were the direct causes of their subjugation by Rome. For the gigantic struggle of the second Punic war occupied the great republic for nearly twenty years, during which all these sovrans had ample time to gain experience; they had not been shaken on their thrones, and had been engaged in struggles sufficient to develop any talents they possessed. But it was an age strangely lacking in genius. One colossal figure towers above all—the Barcide Hannibal; the rest are mediocre or below mediocrity. Ptolemy Philopator, as I have said, was the most insignificant. We note first in him the curious and rapid change of the great family of the Lagidae into debauchees, dilettanti, drunkards, dolts. We saw even in the great Euergetes a decay in power and activity while he was yet in middle age. His son was a feeble and colourless person, in the hands of a clever old diplomatist, and was not even stimulated by his brilliant victory at Raphia to wake up from his sloth and his sensual pleasures.[1] He is now further known as a persecutor of Egyptians and their religion, and as having therefore brought Egypt into a state of revolt, which was with difficulty remedied by Ptolemy Epiphanes. The third book of Maccabees makes him a violent persecutor of the Jews, and though the details are manifestly fabulous, the main fact is, I think, truly reported. This will be discussed again in relation to the national reaction of the Jews against Antiochus Epiphanes.

The first glimpse we get of his court is in the conclusion of Plutarch's *Life of Cleomenes*, when the exiled hero,

[1] An isolated notice in Strabo (x. 4, § 8) speaks of his having fortified Gortyn in Crete, for what reason we are not told. I have cited in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* some further evidence which tends to moderate the adverse judgment of Polybius and Strabo.

having lost his kingdom by the battle of Sellasia, came to rejoin his mother and wife, who had been sent as hostages to Euergetes, his paymaster. Antigonus Doson had arranged the matter with Euergetes, and the Egyptian subsidies were stopped, so nothing remained for the Spartan but to go to Egypt, where he might either persuade Euergetes to begin again the struggle for Greece, or serve him as a mercenary. We are told that he greatly impressed the king, and would have been sent back with a fleet and army; but Euergetes died, and his son Philopator succeeded, who was wholly devoted to drinking and revelry and religious orgies. Sosibius and the relatives of the king's mistress became the real rulers of the country; nor had Cleomenes a chance of obtaining a hearing for his projects. Still he was consulted on important matters, especially on the proposed murder of Magas, the king's brother, who was a favourite with the mercenary troops. Cleomenes protested against the crime and its inexpediency, but unfortunately added that as far as the mercenaries were concerned, 3000 of them were Peloponnesians, who would do his bidding at any moment, if he but raised his finger. This alarmed the king's advisers, and they determined to cage the lion. It may be that Phylarchus, the historian from whom Plutarch copies the tragic end of Cleomenes, heightened the real contrast between the calm simple hero in his hardly disguised prison, and the wretched young king, enslaved by lusts and minions. When Cleomenes, who had before rejected the advice to commit suicide, on the ground that he must not abandon his country's hopes, broke out with his retinue of twelve friends one day and called the mob of Alexandria to liberty, the mob of Alexandria, which hardly knew the meaning of the words, gazed upon him as upon some dangerous lunatic. Plutarch says they had just enough

spirit left to praise and admire the boldness of Cleomenes, but none dared to join him. I doubt even this amount of sympathy. When the attempt on the prison failed, and nothing was left to the Spartan but honourable suicide, the wretched Egyptian king could add no vengeance but to hang up his body in a sack, and to have his mother, wife, and children executed. The picture of the Spartan exile walking on the pier at Alexandria, and looking out for news from home, the irony with which the first man he meets from Greece turns out to be a horse-dealer and an impatient creditor, who reports to the court Cleomenes's jibe that the king wants minions and flute-girls, not war-horses—all this forms one of the most attractive pages in Plutarch.

Yet the monarchy was so well established that this debauchee king not only lived out his life in possession of the throne, but fought a successful war against an energetic rival, and left his kingdom to his infant heir, even though his life was curtailed by his vices and his empire by revolt. I will return to the third Syrian war, as it is called, when I come to consider *the diplomacy* of this period. The home policy of Sosibius, the wily prime minister of the king, consisted in 'removing' all persons of importance near the throne, among others, the king's uncle Lysimachus, his brother Magas, his sister and wife Berenike, and the Spartan Cleomenes. Thus we see Egypt degenerating into a mere vulgar oriental despotism. Let us turn to Syria.

Here Achaeus was left in command by the sudden death of Seleucus III. (Soter), but at first he was loyal enough to hand over the crown (which the king's son, an infant, only assumed for a moment) to the late king's younger brother, Antiochus III., a youth of nineteen, who found the empire

in anything but order. This prince, confirming Achaeus in the command of Asia Minor, made his first campaigns against the Greek satraps of Media and Persia, Molon and Alexander. These he conquered chiefly by the prestige of his name. It seems that the Seleucid house had already acquired a divine right in these countries.[1] Then came his great war in Coele-Syria against Ptolemy, when he recovered the country and the forts taken by Euergetes, especially Seleucia on the Orontes, the port of Antioch. And all this time there was a great struggle among various officers of his court, to see who should rule him.[2] Indeed he only got rid of his all-powerful vizier Hermeias, who desired to play the *rôle* of the Egyptian Sosibius in Syria, by stratagem.

The plot was undertaken by the king's favourite physician, Apollophanes, who 'took occasion to address the king, and tell him not to be dilatory or without suspicion about the ambition of Hermeias, nor to delay till he fell into the same snare as his brother had done; that this crisis was not far off, so he besought him to stir himself and save both himself and his friends. But when Antiochus confessed his dislike and fear of Hermeias, and his sincere thanks to Apollophanes for having spoken out about the matter, the latter took courage when he saw that he had not been astray as to the king's mind, and the king urged him to take up the question of safety not only in words but in act. When Apollophanes agreed, they laid their plot, and making the excuse that the king was suffering from dizziness, they dis-

[1] So also the troops of Achaeus, when he led them towards Syria against his nephew, *ἐστασίασαν δυσαρεστούμεναι τῷ δοκεῖν γενέσθαι τὴν στρατείαν ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν ἀὐτῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα βασιλέα* Polyb. v. 57.

[2] *περιεχόμενος δὲ καὶ προκατειλημμένος οἰκονομίαις καὶ φυλακαῖς καὶ θεραπείαις ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑρμείου κακοηθείας οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῦ κύριος* id. 50.

missed the household and those who usually mounted guard for some days, and so took occasion to communicate with such of their friends as they chose, on the plea of their calling to inquire for the king's health. So they matured their plan. The physicians prescribed a walk for Antiochus in the cool of the dawn, and Hermeias came with those of the retinue who knew about it at the appointed time, but most of the rest were late on account of the king going out at so unusual an hour. So they drew Hermeias out into a quiet place away from the camp, and then, while the king turned aside for a moment, stabbed him. Thus Hermeias died, paying no penalty adequate to his misdeeds.' At the publication of the news the women of Apamea stoned the wife of Hermeias to death, and the children of Apamea his sons.[1]

It is to be noted that the great majority of officers at the court of this king are Greeks, indeed the army seems almost entirely commanded by Aetolians, Cretans, Achaeans, with an occasional Galatian chief. Even the armies of Molon and Alexander, which the king overthrew in a personal campaign by his prestige rather than his arms, were partly Greek and partly Galatian. And yet the manners and customs of these armies seem barbarised, and by no means like those of Hellenic belligerents. Polybius even remarks, as I have just cited, that Hermeias, when he was stabbed to death, suffered no adequate retribution for his crimes; by which he means that he escaped torture. Molon and Alexander put their families and themselves to death as soon as they were defeated, knowing what tortures awaited them, and their bodies were set up on gibbets by the king's orders. So again, in the remarkable narrative of the betrayal and capture of Achaeus,[2] when trying to escape from the citadel

[1] Polyb. v. 56. [2] Cf. below, pp. 438 *sq.*

of Sardis, where Antiochus had him closely invested; when the young king, sitting up alone in the night in the greatest excitement, at last sees his enemy thrown bound upon the floor before him, and after long silence bursts into tears, we expect to hear of a reconciliation or pardon; but nothing of the sort ensues. The peers assemble at break of day to discuss what kind of revenge is to be wreaked upon him, and they resolve first to mutilate him by cutting off his limbs, and then to sew him up in a sack of ass-skin, and gibbet the body. There seems to be some oriental notion of uncleanness suggested in this use of the ass-skin.

If we should infer from these details that Antiochus III. was cruel in disposition we should err greatly. In his subsequent wars in the East he showed considerable generosity to vanquished foes, and in several cases replaced them in their dominions. The one crime, which is to be expiated by every torture, is *treason*, revolt against the lawful sovran, in this again showing a spirit akin to that of the Middle Ages, when the same crime was treated as far the most heinous known to the law.

While we hear a great deal from Polybius about the early campaigns of Antiochus, whose reconquest of his kingdom, whose great campaign in his north-east provinces,[1] and whose personal prowess and general activity

[1] Polyb. xi. 34 'Euthydemus was himself a Magnesian, and he answered the envoy by saying that "Antiochus was acting unjustly in trying to expel him from his kingdom. He was not himself a revolted subject, but had destroyed the descendant of some who had been such, and so had obtained the kingdom of Bactria." After adding more arguments to the same effect, he urged Teleas to act as a sincere mediator of peace, by urging Antiochus not to grudge him the royal title and dignity, "for if he did not yield to this demand, neither of them would be safe: seeing that great hords of Nomads were close at hand, who were a danger to both; and that if they admitted them into the country, it would certainly be utterly barbarised." With these words he sent Teleas back to

justify thoroughly his epithet of Antiochus *the Great*, we cannot obtain any very clear notion of the man as distinct from other active rulers. In his youth he shows considerable vacillation in his policy, owing to the conflicting opinions of his advisers, and yet when he once takes a thing in hand he does it well. But to most readers he is only known as the luxurious, feeble, ambitious[1] man of fifty, who attacked the Romans in Greece, and then lost

Antiochus. The king had long been looking about for some means of ending the controversy; and when he was informed by Teleas of what Euthydemus had said, he readily admitted these pleas for a pacification. And after several journeys of Teleas to and fro between the two, Euthydemus at last sent his son Demetrius to confirm the terms of the treaty. Antiochus received the young prince; and judging from his appearance, conversation, and the dignity of his manners that he was worthy of royal power, he first promised to give him one of his own daughters, and secondly conceded the royal title to his father. And having on the other points caused a written treaty to be drawn up, and the terms of the treaty to be confirmed on oath, he marched away; after liberally provisioning his troops, and accepting the elephants belonging to Euthydemus. He crossed the Caucasus and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasenus the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had a hundred and fifty altogether; and having once more provisioned his troops, set out again personally with his army: leaving Androsthenes of Cyzicus the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him. Having traversed Arachosia and crossed the river Erymanthus, he came through Drangene to Carmania; and, as it was now winter, he put his men into winter quarters there. This was the extreme limit of the march of Antiochus into the interior: in which he not only reduced the up-country Satraps to obedience to his authority, but also the coast cities, and the princes on this side Taurus; and, in a word, consolidated his kingdom by overawing all his subjects with the exhibition of his boldness and energy. For this campaign convinced the Europeans as well as the Asiatics that he was worthy of royal power.'

[1] Even his ambition must have died out with increasing age, since after his defeat 'dicere est solitus, benigne sibi a populo Romano esse factum, quod, nimis magna procuratione liberatus, modicis regni terminis uteretur' Cic. *pro rege Deiot.* 13.

his power by a single battle (Magnesia, 190 B.C.) His epithet of *Great* is inexplicable without some knowledge of his early history.

The portrait of Philip V. is far more distinct. Educated with care for the throne by the wise and able Antigonus Doson, he possessed, according to Polybius, the necessary qualities for a sovran in a high degree. It is very interesting to see what these qualities are, and in what order Polybius enumerates them. 'It is not easy to find,' says he (iv. 77), 'a king endowed with more natural advantages for the control of affairs. For he had both smartness and a good memory, and exceptional grace of manner'—so far one might imagine the historian describing our Prince of Wales—'and besides, a royal presence and dignity, but what is most important of all, resource and daring in war. And what it was that overcame all these advantages and turned a king by nature into a brutal tyrant, is not easy to explain in a few words.' Plutarch, on the other hand,[1] reverses the matter: 'When through the favours of fortune he was puffed up, and had nurtured within him many strong desires, his inborn badness overcoming his artificial pretences, and emerging by degrees, exposed his real character, so that he seduced the younger Aratus's wife while staying in his house as a guest,' etc. He repeats[2] this view, and says 'that Philip appears to have undergone the most unexpected change, becoming a vicious man and destructive tyrant, from being a gentle king and a modest youth. This, however, was no real change of nature, but the disclosure in the time of his security of that wickedness which had

[1] *Aratus* 49.

[2] *Aratus* 51 *sub fin.* This, by the way, is in accordance with an ethical principle or theory, which he develops elsewhere. Cf. *de ser. num. vind.* xx.

long been hidden during his fears.' Polybius, however, comes back to his point (x. 26), and insists that he was really good at first, but that his vices developed with increasing age, as is the case with some horses.

This curious declension in the Antigonid house is not a little remarkable. Since Demetrius the Besieger there had been nothing but serious and able men in that family, with the one exception of Demetrius the Fair, who had lost his life by his love intrigues. But here is a young man brought up in the traditions of this greatness, who belies it all, and turns his abilities and his charm to the worst purposes. In two respects, however, his early life contrasts strongly with those of his predecessors. In the first place, while they, like Antiochus the Great, began their reigns by reconquering all their kingdom, and displaying great military activity in these dangers, Philip came to the throne the darling of all Greece. Everybody was his friend. Even the wild and warring Cretan cities agreed voluntarily to submit to his authority. He escaped, therefore, the stern lessons of adversity, which had hardened and exercised the youth of earlier Macedonian kings. Secondly, Antigonus Doson, his guardian, who was evidently a practical man, and no theorist, seems to have entrusted his education not to philosophers but to politicians, or rather diplomatists, whose deceitful and tortuous ways were anything but wholesome for a prince.

Among these the most remarkable was Aratus, whose character we know, and whose rage against tyrants and tyranny was tempered with much obsequiousness to hereditary princes. No doubt he was a most competent instructor in the intricacies of Peloponnesian politics, but what high principle, what noble sentiment, what real dignity, could be learned from that wily old diplomatist? Even in war

his motto was the exact reverse of Alexander's famous *οὐ κλέπτω τὴν νίκην*. Moreover the officers to whom Doson, who felt his health breaking down, left the charge of affairs, seem to have been badly chosen, and to have rather set on the young king to vice than kept him in the path of virtue. Above all, these people had no *ideas*, like the Borysthenite fanatic who inspired Cleomenes, and I can see in this age a sort of discrediting of the higher teaching, which had maintained the spirit and the morals of earlier generations. The great philosophers, as I have noted, were gone. Their successors, more numerous, more diffused through the world, were perhaps no longer thought great enough to be instructors of kings. In any case, the theory of divine right was fatal in its consequences; for why educate in moral principles a personage whose every caprice must be just?

The one science which seemed worth studying in that day was diplomacy, and diplomacy understood as the science of deceiving men who had already been deceived, and who ought therefore to be proof against ordinary wiles. It is a frequent remark of Polybius, when recounting the surprises and treacheries which were now constantly taking place, that man, who is supposed the most intelligent of all animals, is really the silliest and most gullible, for that no amount of experience in deceit will prevent him from trusting afresh the very people whom he has seen profiting by treachery.[1] There are seasons in the world's history when

[1] Polyb. v. 75 'It seems to me that man is the most easily deceived of all animals, though he is reckoned the most sagacious. For how many camps and forts, how many and how great cities have not been taken by treachery? And though this has happened so continually and so publicly to so many, I know not how it is that we are by nature ever new and young as regards these deceits.' He attributes this to a want of intelligent study of past history.

this sort of systematised deceit becomes the highest fashion, and when to be a statesman merely means to succeed in practising it. The appeal to the great sound instincts of the human race never disappears; the eternal homage which vice pays to virtue cannot be shaken off, nay, it is one of the noblest signs of the indestructibility of our moral nature that every villain not only praises virtue and affects it, but trades upon it. Nevertheless there are days when great ideas flourish, and others when they seem to lose their hold on the world. The epoch upon which we are now entering is one of the latter. With Antigonus Doson and Cleomenes the great age of Hellenism is gone.

Can we see any reasons for this decay of principle, and this rise of the reign of mere expediency? I think we can, even if they be not thought sufficient to account for the whole change. The spread of Hellenism over the large area of Alexander's empire was distinctly the spread of cosmopolitanism, of the Greek language, and of a common standard of manners. All the new capitals and courts aimed at the same sort of etiquette, the same kind of elegance, the same splendour. They all affected the same taste for the arts and luxuries of life. So likewise the people that lived in these and other Hellenistic cities were moulded on the same type, and though it might happen in outlying Parthian cities that in a crisis the orientals would rise and murder all the Greek inhabitants,[1] and though in Egypt or Judaea the severance was still clear, in most of these cities the races were fused, and all real sense of nationality was gone.

So it was with the armies. Whether it be Hiero fighting in Sicily or Antiochus in Bactria, the soldiers were Arcadians, Aetolians, Cretans, Galatians, under the command of

[1] Polyb. x. 31.

Rhodians, Achaeans, Athenians, Spartans. Even the ancient and conservative Spartans, and the hardly less conservative Achaeans, fought their wars with mercenaries, and armed their men as a Macedonian phalanx. There were such things as citizen militias, and Philopoemen presently made his fame by reviving one for the Achaean League. But elsewhere war was a matter of money, and all the armies fought for pay and not for patriotism. Indeed the philosophers had long preached against this antique virtue as mere narrowness of mind, leading to much discomfort, and had insisted that exile was no real punishment. But however patriotism may be superseded in stray individuals by larger benevolence, bodies of men who abandon it will only replace it by meaner motives.

Hence the decay of patriotism, produced both by the spread of Hellenism and by the doctrines of the philosophers, brought with it the decay of high feeling, of *sentiment* in politics, of sacrifice for an idea, and left in their place the mere computation of sordid interest. Accordingly the field of diplomacy became terribly enlarged. Before every siege or battle the first thing was to tempt the opposite side with bribes, to offer the mercenary leaders higher pay. This was the most effectual strategy. Aratus knew, says Polybius, when he made overtures to his old enemy Antigonus, 'that the friendships of kings are purely determined by their interests, and that such a thing as fast friendship or undying hate was not to be expected.' In the midst of the most vigorous campaigns or sieges there were always communications going on between the belligerents. There were also, as I already explained in my sketch of Rhodes, mediating powers ever ready to tender their good offices, and diplomatic parleying was perpetually interchanging with raids and battles. I will give as specimens of this kind of warfare

two curious narratives, in all their detail, from Polybius, by which the reader will see more clearly than by general statements the spirit of the age portrayed in its leading events. Polybius, though a poor writer, is always most instructive, and sometimes even picturesque, when his subject leads him to give a connected narrative of some great adventure. The story of the capture of Achaeus is perhaps the most striking of these episodes.[1] But I begin with the transactions which preceded the Syrian war between Antiochus the Great and Ptolemy Philopator.[2]

The character of Ptolemy was so feeble, and his neglect of all military preparations had been so great, that the idea of protecting his rights with his sword, which was his most obvious duty, never occurred to him.

Agathocles and Sosibius, however, his leading ministers at that time, took counsel together and did the best they could with the means at their disposal, in view of the existing crisis. They resolved to devote themselves to the preparations for war; and meanwhile, by embassies to try to retard the advance of Antiochus, pretending to confirm him in the opinion he originally entertained about Ptolemy, namely, that the latter would not venture to fight, but would trust to negotiations and the interposition of common friends to induce Antiochus to evacuate Coele-Syria. Having determined upon this policy Agathocles and Sosibius, to whom the whole business was entrusted, lost no time in sending their embassies to Antiochus: and at the same time they sent messages to Rhodes, Byzantium, and Cyzicus, not omitting the Aetolians, inviting them to send commissioners to discuss the terms of a settlement. The commissioners duly arrived, and by occupying the time with going backwards and forwards between the two kings, abundantly secured to these statesmen

[1] In saying this I do not forget the brilliant story of the capture of Tarentum by Hannibal (viii. 26-36), perhaps the best of all his narratives. But on the Italian side of Polybius I may refer the reader to Mr. Strachan Davidson's *Selections* (Oxford, 1888).

[2] Polyb. v. 63 *sq.*

what they wanted—delay, and time to make their preparations for war. They fixed their residence at Memphis, and there carried on these negotiations continuously. Nor were they less attentive to the ambassadors from Antiochus, whom they received with every mark of courtesy and kindness. But meanwhile they were calling up and collecting at Alexandria the mercenaries whom they had on service in towns outside Egypt; were despatching men to recruit foreign soldiers; and were collecting provisions both for the troops they already possessed and for those that were coming in. No less active were they in every other department of military preparation. They took turns in going on rapid and frequent visits to Alexandria, to see that the supplies should in no point be inadequate to the undertaking before them. The manufacture of arms, the selection of men, and their division into companies, they committed to the care of Echecrates of Thessaly and Phoxidas of Melita. With these they associated Eurylochus of Magnesia and Socrates of Boeotia, who were also joined by Cnopias of Allaria. By the greatest good fortune they had got hold of these officers, who, while serving with Demetrius (II. of Macedon) and Antigonus (Doson), had acquired some experience of real war and actual service in the field. Accordingly when these took command of the Egyptian population, they made the best of them by giving them the training of soldiers.

Their first measure was to divide them according to their country and age, and to assign to each division its appropriate arms, taking no account of what they had borne before. Next they broke up their battalions and muster-rolls, which had been formed on the basis of their old system of pay, and formed them into companies adapted to the immediate purpose. Having effected this they began to drill the men; habituating them severally not only to obey the words of command, but also to the proper management of their weapons.[1] They also frequently summoned general meetings at headquarters, and delivered speeches to the men.

[1] Though it is not very clear in Polybius's narrative, I am convinced that this paragraph refers mainly to the training of the native Egyptians, whose old military caste had been long neglected and disused, though it possibly still existed in name. In v. 107 Polybius specially notices the effect of the present policy upon the Egyptians.

The most useful in this respect were Andromachus of Aspendus and Polycrates of Argos; because they had recently crossed from Greece, and were still thoroughly imbued with the Greek spirit, and the military ideas prevalent in the several states. Moreover, they were illustrious on the score of their private wealth, as well as on that of their respective countries; to which advantages Polycrates added those of an ancient family and of the reputation obtained by his father Mnasiadas as an athlete. By private and public exhortations these officers inspired their men with a zeal and enthusiasm for the struggle which awaited them. All these officers, too, had commands in the army suited to their particular accomplishments. Eurylochus of Magnesia commanded about three thousand men of what was called in the royal armies the Agema, or Guard; Socrates of Boeotia had two thousand light-armed troops under him; while the Achaean Phoxidas, and Ptolemy the son of Thraseas, and Andromachus of Aspendus were associated in the duty of drilling the phalanx [of Egyptians] and the mercenary Greek soldiers on the same ground—Andromachus and Ptolemy commanding the phalanx, Phoxidas the mercenaries, of which the numbers were respectively twenty-five thousand and eight thousand. The cavalry, again, attached to the court, amounting to seven hundred, as well as that which was obtained from Libya or enlisted from the native Egyptians, were being trained by Polycrates, and were under his personal command, amounting in all to about three thousand men. In the actual campaign the most effective service was performed by the Greek cavalry, which with the whole body of mercenary cavalry, amounting to two thousand men, was splendidly trained by Echecrates of Thessaly. No one took more pains with the men under his command than Cnopias of Allaria. He commanded all the Cretans, who numbered three thousand, and among them a thousand Neo-Cretans over whom he had set Philo of Cnossus. They also armed three thousand Libyans in the Macedonian fashion, who were commanded by Ammonius of Barce. The Egyptians themselves supplied twenty thousand soldiers to the phalanx, and were under the command of Sosibius. A body of Thracians and Gauls was also enrolled, four thousand being taken from mercenaries settled in the country and their descendants, while two thousand had been recently enlisted and brought over; and these were under the command of Diony-

sius of Thrace. Such in its numbers, and in the variety of the elements of which it was composed, was the force which was being got ready for Ptolemy.

Meanwhile Antiochus had been engaged in the siege of Doura: but the strength of the place and the support given it by Nicolaus prevented him from effecting anything; and as the winter was closing in, he agreed with the ambassadors of Ptolemy to a suspension of hostilities for four months, and promised that he would discuss the whole question at issue in a friendly spirit. But he was as far as possible from being sincere in this negotiation: his real object was to avoid being detained any length of time from his own country, and to be able to place his troops in winter quarters at Seleucia, because Achaeus was now notoriously plotting against him, and without disguise co-operating with Ptolemy. So, having come to this agreement, Antiochus dismissed the ambassadors with injunctions to acquaint him as soon as possible with the decision of Ptolemy, and to meet him at Seleucia. He then placed the necessary guards in the various strongholds, committed to Theodotus the command-in-chief over them all, and returned home. On his arrival at Seleucia he distributed his forces into their winter quarters; and from that time forth he took no pains to keep the mass of his army under discipline, being persuaded that the business would not call for any more fighting; because he was already master of some portions of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, and expected to secure the rest by voluntary submission or by diplomacy: for Ptolemy, he believed, would not venture upon a general engagement. This opinion was shared also by the ambassadors, because Sosibius fixing his residence at Memphis conducted his negotiations with them in a friendly manner, while he prevented those who went backwards and forwards to Antiochus from ever becoming eye-witnesses of the preparations that were being carried on at Alexandria.[1] Nay even by the time that the ambassadors arrived, Sosibius was already prepared for every eventuality.

[1] The only highway from Syria to Alexandria was through Pelusium up to Memphis, and from Memphis down the Nile to Alexandria—this last some 80 miles. There was no road across the Delta, and to coast along it westward was impracticable, owing to the constant NW. winds. Hence Syrian ambassadors to Memphis would see nothing of Alexandrian preparations.

Meanwhile Antiochus was extremely anxious to have as much the advantage over the government of Alexandria in diplomatic argument as he had in arms. Accordingly when the ambassadors arrived at Seleucia, and both parties began, in accordance with the instructions of Sosibius, to discuss the clauses of the proposed arrangement in detail, the king made very light of the loss recently sustained by Ptolemy, and the injury which had been manifestly inflicted upon him by the existing occupation of Coele-Syria; and in the pleadings on this subject he refused to look upon this transaction in the light of an injury at all, alleging that certain things belonged to him of right. He asserted that the original occupation of the country by (the first) Antigonus, and the royal authority exercised over it by (the first) Seleucus, constituted an absolutely decisive and equitable claim, in virtue of which Coele-Syria belonged of right to himself and not to Ptolemy; for Ptolemy I. went to war with Antigonus with the view of annexing this country not to his own government but to that of Seleucus. But, above all, he pressed the convention entered into by the three kings, Casander, Lysimachus, and Seleucus, when, after having conquered Antigonus, they deliberated in common upon the arrangements to be made, and decided that the whole of Syria should belong to Seleucus.

The commissioners of Ptolemy endeavoured to establish the opposite case. They magnified the existing injury and dilated on its hardship, asserting that the treason of Theodotus and the invasion of Antiochus amounted to a breach of treaty-rights. They alleged the possession of these places in the reign of Ptolemy I., son of Lagus, and tried to show that Ptolemy had joined Seleucus in the war on the understanding that he was to invest Seleucus with the government of the whole of Asia, but was to take Coele-Syria and Phoenicia for himself.

Such were the arguments brought forward by the two contracting parties in the course of the embassies and counter-embassies and conferences. There was no prospect, however, of arriving at any result, because the controversy was conducted, not by the principals, but by the common friends of both; and there was no one to intervene authoritatively to check and control the caprice of the party which they might decide to be

in the wrong. But what caused the most insuperable difficulty was the matter of Achaeus. For Ptolemy was eager that the terms of the treaty should include him; while Antiochus would not allow the subject to be so much as mentioned, and was indignant that Ptolemy should venture to protect rebels, or bring such a point into the discussion at all.

The approach of spring found both sides weary of negotiations, and with no prospect of coming to a conclusion. Antiochus therefore began collecting his forces with a view of making an invasion by land and sea, and completing his conquest of Coele-Syria.

Here is the second passage[1]:—

Bolis was by birth a Cretan, who had long enjoyed the honours of high military rank at the Egyptian court, and the reputation of being second to none in natural ability, adventurous daring, and experience in war. By repeated arguments Sosibius tested this man's fidelity; and when he felt sure of his zeal and affection he communicated the business in hand to him. He told him that he could not do the king a more acceptable service at the present crisis, than by contriving some way of saving Achaeus [who was now closely besieged in the citadel of Sardis]. At the moment Bolis listened, and retired without saying more than that he would consider the suggestion. But after two or three days' reflection, he came to Sosibius and said that he would undertake the business; remarking that having spent some considerable time at Sardis he knew its topography, and that Cambylus, the commander of the Cretan contingent of the army of Antiochus, was not only a fellow-citizen of his, but a kinsman and friend to boot. It chanced moreover that Cambylus and his men had in charge one of the outposts on the rear of the acropolis, where the nature of the ground did not admit of siege works, but the place was guarded by a permanent cantonment of troops under Cambylus. Sosibius caught at the suggestion, convinced that if Achaeus could be saved at all from his dangerous situation it could be better accomplished by the agency of Bolis than any one else; and this conviction being backed by readi-

[1] viii. 17 *sq.*

ness on the part of Bolis, the undertaking soon began to mature. Sosibius at once supplied the money necessary for the attempt, and promised a large sum besides in case of its success; at the same time raising the hopes of Bolis to the utmost by dilating upon the favours he might expect from the king, as well as from the rescued prince himself.

Full of eagerness, therefore, for success, Bolis set sail without delay, taking with him a letter in cipher and other credentials addressed to Nicomachus at Rhodes, who was believed to entertain a fatherly affection and devotion for Achaeus, and also to Melancomas at Ephesus; for these were the men formerly employed by Achaeus in his negotiations with Ptolemy and in all other foreign affairs.

Bolis went to Rhodes, and thence to Ephesus: communicated his purpose to Nicomachus and Melancomas, and found them ready to do what they were asked. He then despatched one of his staff, named Arianus, to Cambylus with a message to the effect that he had been sent from Alexandria on a recruiting tour, and that he wished for an interview with Cambylus on some matters of importance; he thought it therefore necessary to have a time and place arranged for them to meet, without the privity of a third person. Arianus quickly obtained an interview with Cambylus and delivered his message; nor was the latter at all unwilling to listen to the proposal. Having appointed a day, and a place known to both himself and Bolis, at which he would be after nightfall, he dismissed Arianus.

Now Bolis had all the subtlety of a Cretan, and he accordingly weighed carefully in his own mind every possible line of action, and patiently examined every idea which presented itself to him. Finally he met Cambylus, according to the arrangement made with Arianus, and delivered his letter. This was now made the subject of a truly Cretical discussion between them. They never took into consideration the means of saving the person in danger, or their obligations of honour to those who had entrusted them with the undertaking; but confined their discussion entirely to the question of their own safety and their own advantage. As they were both Cretans they were not long in coming to an agreement; which was, first of all, to divide the ten talents supplied by Sosibius between themselves in equal shares, and, secondly,

to discover the whole affair to Antiochus, and to offer with his support to put Achaeus into his hands, on condition of receiving a sum of money, and promises for the future, on a scale commensurate with the greatness of the undertaking. Having settled upon this plan of action, Cambylus undertook the negotiation with Antiochus, while to Bolis was assigned the duty of sending Arianus within the next few days to Achaeus bearing letters in cipher from Nicomachus and Melancomas; he bade Cambylus however take upon himself to consider how Arianus was to make his way into the acropolis and return with safety. 'If,' said Bolis, 'Achaeus consents to make the attempt, and sends an answer to Nicomachus and Melancomas, I will be ready to act and will communicate with you.' Having thus arranged the part which each was to take in the plot, they separated, and set about their several tasks.

At the first opportunity Cambylus laid the proposal before the king. It was as acceptable to Antiochus as it was unexpected: in the first flush of his exultation he promised everything they asked; but presently feeling some distrust, he questioned Cambylus on every detail of their plan, and their means of carrying it out. Being eventually satisfied on these points, and believing that the undertaking was under the special favour of Providence, he repeatedly begged and prayed Cambylus to bring it to a conclusion. Bolis was equally successful with Nicomachus and Melancomas. They entertained no doubt of his sincerity, and joined him in the composition of letters to Achaeus—composed in a cipher which they had been accustomed to use—exhorting him to trust Bolis and Cambylus. So Arianus, having by the aid of Cambylus made his way into the acropolis, delivered the letters to Achaeus; and having had personal acquaintance with the whole business from its commencement, he was able to give an account of every detail when questioned and cross-questioned again and again by Achaeus about Sosibius and Bolis, about Nicomachus and Melancomas, and most particularly about the part which Cambylus was taking in the affair. He could of course stand this cross-examination with sincerity and candour, because in point of fact he was not acquainted with the most important part of the plan which Cambylus and Bolis had adopted. Achaeus was convinced by the answers of Arianus, and still more by the cipher of Nicomachus and Melancomas;

wrote his answer; and sent Arianus back with it without delay. This kind of communication was repeated more than once, and at last Achaeus entrusted himself without reserve to Nicomachus, there being absolutely no other hope of saving himself, and bade him send Bolis with Arianus on a certain moonless night, promising to place himself in their hands. The idea of Achaeus was first of all to escape his immediate danger, and then by a circuitous route to make his way into Syria. For he entertained very great hopes that if he appeared suddenly and unexpectedly to the Syrians, while Antiochus was still lingering about Sardis, he would be able to stir up a great movement, and meet with a cordial reception from the people of Antioch, Coele-Syria, and Phoenicia.

With such expectations and calculations Achaeus awaited the appearance of Bolis.

Meanwhile Arianus had reached Melancomas, who, on reading the letter which he brought, immediately despatched Bolis with many words of exhortation and great promises of profit if he succeeded in his enterprise. Bolis sent Arianus in advance to signify his arrival to Cambylus, and went after nightfall to their usual place of meeting. There they spent a whole day together settling every detail of their plan of operations; and having done this they went into the camp under cover of night. The arrangement made between them was this. If it turned out that Achaeus came from the acropolis alone with Bolis and Arianus, or with only one attendant, he would give them no cause for anxiety at all, but would be easily captured by the ambuscade set for him. If, on the other hand, he should be accompanied by a considerable number, the business would be one of some difficulty to those entrusted with it, especially as they were anxious to capture him alive, because it would most gratify Antiochus. In that case, therefore, Arianus, while conducting Achaeus, must go in front, because he knew the path by which he had on several occasions effected his entrance and return; Bolis was to bring up the rear, in order that, when they arrived at the spot where Cambylus was to have his ambuscade ready, he might lay hold on Achaeus, and prevent his getting away through wooded ground, in the confusion and darkness of the night, or throwing himself in despair from some precipice: thus they would

secure that he fell as they intended into his enemies' hands alive.

These arrangements having been agreed upon, Bolis was taken by Cambylus on the very night of his arrival, without any one else, and introduced to Antiochus. The king was alone and received them graciously; he pledged himself to the performance of his promises, and urged them both again and again not to postpone any longer the performance of their purpose. Thereupon they returned for the present to their own camp: but towards morning Bolis accompanied by Arianus ascended the acropolis, and entered it before daybreak.

Achaeus received them with warmth and cordiality, and questioned Bolis at great length on every detail. From the expression of his face and his conversation he judged Bolis to be a man of a character weighty enough for so serious an undertaking; but while he exulted in the prospect of his release, he likewise grew painfully excited, and was torn with an agony of anxiety, at the gravity of the issues at stake. But no one had a clearer head or greater experience in affairs than he; and accordingly he determined that his safety should not depend entirely on the good faith of Bolis. He therefore told him that it was impossible for him to leave the acropolis at the moment, but that he would send some two or three of his friends with him, and by the time that they had joined Melancomas he would be prepared to depart. Thus Achaeus did all he could for his security; but he did not know that he was trying to do what the proverb declares to be impossible—outwit a Cretan. For there was no trick likely to be tried that Bolis had not anticipated. However when the night came, in which Achaeus said that he would send his friends with them, he sent on Arianus and Bolis to the entrance of the acropolis, with instructions to wait there until those who were to go with them arrived. They did as he bade them. Achaeus then at the very moment of his departure communicated his plan to his wife Laodice, and she was so terrified at his sudden resolve that he had to spend some time in entreating her to be calm, in soothing her feelings, and encouraging her by pointing out the hopes which he entertained. This done he started with four companions, whom he dressed in ordinary clothes, while he himself put on a mean and common dress and disguised his rank as much as possible.

He selected one of his four companions to be always prepared to answer anything said by Arianus, and to ask any necessary question of him, and bade him say that the other four did not speak Greek.

The five then joined Arianus and they all started together on their journey. Arianus went in front as being acquainted with the way, while Bolis took up his position behind in accordance with the original plan, puzzled and annoyed at the way things were turning out. For, Cretan as he was, and ready to suspect every one he came near, he yet could not make out which of the five was Achaeus, or whether he was there at all. But the path was for the most part precipitous and difficult, and in some places there were abrupt descents which were slippery and dangerous; and whenever they came to one of these, some of the four gave Achaeus a hand down and the others caught him at the bottom, for they could not entirely conceal their habitual respect for him; and Bolis was quick to detect by observing this which of them was Achaeus, and what place he occupied in the party. When therefore they arrived at the spot at which it had been arranged that Cambylus was to be, Bolis gave the signal by a whistle, and the men sprang from their places of concealment, and seized the other four, while Bolis himself threw his arms round Achaeus, mantle and all, to secure his hands, which were inside it; for he was afraid that having a sword concealed about his person he would attempt to kill himself when he understood what was happening. Being thus quickly surrounded on every side, Achaeus fell into the hands of his enemies, and along with his four friends was taken straight off to Antiochus.

The king was in his tent in a state of extreme anxiety awaiting the result. He had dismissed his usual staff, with the exception of two or three aides-de-camp, and sat up alone and sleepless. But when Cambylus and his men entered, and laid Achaeus bound upon the ground, he fell into a state of speechless astonishment and for a considerable time could not utter a word; finally overcome by emotion he burst into tears, caused I have no doubt by this exhibition of the capriciousness of fortune, which defies precaution and calculation alike. For here was Achaeus, a son of Andromachus, the brother of Seleucus's queen Laodice, and married to Laodice,

a daughter of King Mithradates, who had made himself master of all Asia this side of Taurus, and who at that very moment was believed by his own army, as well as by that of his enemy, to be safely ensconced in the strongest position in the world—sitting bound upon the ground, in the hands of his enemies, before a single person knew of it except those who had effected the capture.

And indeed when at daybreak the king's friends assembled as usual at his tent, and saw this strange spectacle, they too felt emotions very like those of the king; while extreme astonishment made them almost disbelieve the evidence of their senses. However the council met, and a long debate ensued as to what punishment they were to inflict upon Achaeus. Finally it was resolved that his extremities should be cut off, his head severed from his body and sewn up in the skin of an ass, and his body gibbeted.

When this sentence had been carried out, and the army learnt what had happened, there was such excitement in the ranks and such a rush of the soldiers to the spectacle, that Laodice on the acropolis, who alone knew that her husband had left it, guessed what had happened from the commotion and stir in the camp. And before long a herald arrived, told Laodice what had befallen Achaeus, and summoned her to resign the command and quit the acropolis. At first any answer was prevented by an outburst of sorrow and overpowering lamentation on the part of the occupants of the acropolis; not so much from affection towards Achaeus, as from the suddenness and utter unexpectedness of the catastrophe. But this was succeeded by a feeling of hesitation and dismay; and Antiochus having got rid of Achaeus never ceased putting pressure on the garrison of the acropolis, feeling confident that a means of taking it would be put into his hands by those who occupied it, and most probably by the rank and file of the garrison. And this is just what did finally happen: for the soldiers split up into factions, one joining Ariobazus, the other Laodice. This produced mutual distrust, and before long both parties surrendered themselves and the acropolis. Thus Achaeus, in spite of having taken every reasonable precaution, lost his life by the perfidy of those in whom he trusted. His fate may teach posterity two useful lessons—not to put faith in any one lightly; and not to be over-confident in the

hour of prosperity, knowing that, in human affairs, there is no accident which may not happen.

This latter narrative shows clearly the treachery with which war was carried on, and the reflections of Polybius on these things are curious. 'Those,' he says (viii. 2), 'who put themselves in the hands of their enemies thoughtlessly are to be blamed, not those who have taken every possible precaution. For to trust nobody at all is impracticable, but if we exact what securities are possible, and act reasonably, we cannot be blamed. The possible securities are oaths, children and women (as hostages), but most of all the previous life (of the parties). To fail with these and fall into trouble is the fault of the doers, not of the sufferers. Wherefore it is one's duty to seek out such securities as the person who has given them cannot violate. But as such are indeed rarely to be had, our second consideration should be that if we are deceived, we should at least secure the sympathy of mankind, and not forfeit it, as did most of those whose cases have been narrated. The plainest and the most proximate example is the case of Achaeus, who, taking all possible precautions for his safety, and forecasting all that human wisdom could do, nevertheless fell into his enemies' hands. His misfortune, therefore, excites sympathy and pity, but strong resentment against those who did the deed.'

I said before that in the case of Antiochus cruel punishments seemed generally limited to those guilty of high treason, but the details of the campaigns of Philip, occurring about the same time in Greece, and afterwards in Asia Minor, show a general depravation in the habits of war, which I attribute to the constant use of non-Hellenic mercenaries—Thracians and Galatians—whom the ruder Greeks, Aetolians and Cretans, but too often imitated. There were

no longer, however, those great massacres after a victory which shock us in Athenian and Spartan warfare, and upon which I have commented in my earlier studies.[1] This change arose, of course, from the new character of the armies. The citizen prisoners of a hostile army were hated foes, who could not be reconciled, and whose massacre disabled the enemy. Nowadays the prisoners were mercenaries, who were valuable to anybody who could pay them, and who would not fight in a war to the death.[2]

But when it came to plundering or ravaging hostile countries, these mercenaries, who had no land of their own upon which retaliation could be exercised, were of course far more reckless and ruthless than the old citizen militias. Thus Galatians, at least, thought nothing of burning temples, devastating sacred groves and ornamental gardens, and even of rifling the tombs of ancient kings, who had been buried with ornaments and treasure. This was first done with the tombs of the Macedonian kings at Aegae, which were rifled by the Galatae serving under Pyrrhus, and he was greatly censured for permitting it.[3] In the wars narrated by Polybius, we have numerous cases of sacrilegious burning of temples, destruction of fair buildings and works of art, and we even find that what the rude Aetolian mercenaries sought in a captured town was not so much money as valuables of this kind.[4] They had adorned their capital Thermus in this way with great splendour, but were paid in their own coin, when it was

[1] *Social Life in Greece* p. 234.

[2] Polybius (xi. 13) notices that mercenaries serve very differently under democracies and under tyrants. For the former only want them to gain the victory, and then discard them, whereas the more a tyranny flourishes the more it requires them.

[3] Plut. *Pyrrhus* 26.

[4] Polyb. v. 8, 9.

taken and ruined in a sudden raid by King Philip V. of Macedon.

But Philip, thanks to the energy with which the Macedonians conducted the march, arrived late in the day at Thermus. There he pitched a camp, and allowed his men to go off plundering the neighbouring villages and scouring the plain of Thermus, as well as to sack the dwelling-houses in Thermus itself, which were full, not only of corn and such like provisions, but of all the most valuable property which the Aetolians possessed. For as the annual fair and most famous games, as well as the elections, were held there, everybody kept their most costly possessions in store at Thermus, to enable them to entertain their friends, and to celebrate the festivals with proper magnificence. But besides this occasion for the employment of their property, they expected to find the most complete security for it there, because no enemy had ever yet ventured to penetrate to that place; while its natural strength was so great as to serve as an acropolis to the whole of Aetolia. The place therefore having been in the enjoyment of peace from time immemorial, not only were the buildings immediately round the temple filled with a great variety of property, but the homesteads on the outskirts also. For that night the army bivouacked on the spot laden with booty of every description; but the next morning they selected the most valuable and portable part of it, and making the rest into a heap in front of their tents, set fire to it. So also in regard to the dedicated arms which were hanging up in the porticoes—those of them which were valuable they took down and carried off, some they exchanged for their own, while the rest they collected together and burnt. The number of these was more than fifteen thousand.

Up to this point everything was right and fair by the laws of war; but I do not know how to characterise their next proceedings. For remembering what the Aetolians had done at Dium and Dodona, they burnt the colonnades, and destroyed what were left of the dedicated offerings, some of which were of costly material, and had been elaborated with great skill and expense. And they were not content with destroying the roofs of these buildings with fire, they levelled them to their foundations; and threw down all the statues, which numbered no less

than two thousand; and many of them they broke in pieces, sparing only those that were inscribed with the names or figures of gods. Such they did abstain from injuring. On the walls also they wrote the celebrated line composed by Samus, the son of Chrysogonus, a foster-brother of the king, whose genius was then beginning to manifest itself. The line was this—

'Seest thou the path the bolt divine has sped?'

And in fact the king and his staff were fully convinced that, in thus acting, they were obeying the dictates of right and justice, by retaliating upon the Aetolians with the same impious outrages as they had themselves committed at Dium. But I am clearly of an opposite opinion. And the readiest argument, to prove the correctness of my view, may be drawn from the history of this same royal family of Macedonia.

We find, too, that malcontents, making a mutiny about Philip's court when at Corinth, began by 'smashing the china' he had with him.[1] But in after years he himself, when he had 'degenerated into a savage tyrant,' was the great offender against the accepted laws of civilised war, destroying wantonly and wickedly the ornaments of his enemies' cities, which were of no moment in settling any dispute. It was he who did permanent injury to the fair suburbs of Athens, including the gardens of the philosophers without the walls, by cutting down trees, overturning and breaking statues, burning porticoes, and practising other wanton savagery. He behaved in like manner in the suburbs of Pergamum, and this brutal conduct marks the declension in the Hellenism of this generation.[2]

It is possibly to this period that we may ascribe the rifling of the ancient bee-hive tombs at Orchomenus and Mycenae, which were certainly at one time full of treasure, but which have all been found almost empty when excavated

[1] Polyb. v. 25. [2] xvi. 1.

by Dr. Schliemann.[1] What the godless Galatae began, and did without manifest punishment from either gods or heroes, other mercenaries would soon copy.

In other respects the early years of Philip's reign bear strong points of similarity to those of his contemporaries, Antiochus III. and Ptolemy IV. There was apparently the same court life and etiquette, which is so dangerous for kings, and which tends to deliver them into the hands of the most unscrupulous of their favourites. As Antiochus had his vizier Hermeias, who succeeded in absorbing the whole power, till he was overthrown by a combination of other courtiers, and as Ptolemy had his Sosibius, who was practically king of Egypt through the whole of his reign, so among the advisers of Philip—all appointed to their posts by Antigonus Doson—was Apelles, an able man, and very ambitious to take the first place and control the young prince. For this purpose he entered upon the usual system of intrigues, making some of the court his creatures, and removing others either by calumnies, or by praise—a new method of injuring a man, says Polybius,[2] specially invented by courtiers, for by urging that a man is thrown away in a certain post, and so having him removed, he can be brought into a new position, which the prime minister can control. In policy Apelles was of course opposed to Aratus, whom he desired to sever from the king's intimacy; he wished, moreover, to reduce the Achaean League to the subject condition of the Thessalians, who seemed to have some independence, but were really vassals of Macedonia.

I will not detail the intrigues of Apelles, or how he got

[1] Of course this gives no countenance to the absurd theory that the graves full of treasure which he found were graves of these savage Galatae or of subsequent invaders. On the contrary, they belong to a period far older than the bee-hive tombs.

[2] iv. 87.

Philip so to interfere in the elections at Aegion, that Aratus's candidate was beaten, and a Commander of the opposite party, Eperatus, chosen. What concerns us here is to note the importance of the king's vizier; how he was courted and fêted by all the officers and officials about Philip. 'It happened that Apelles made his residence in Chalcis with more assumption of power (ἐξουσιαστικώτερον) than was his duty; for he showed that the king was young and master of nothing, while the minister took upon himself the whole management of affairs. Whereupon the governors of provinces referred everything to the latter, and the cities of Greece, in their decrees, honours, and gifts, made brief mention of the king, while Apelles was all and everything. At this Philip was already annoyed, and bore it with impatience, especially as Aratus, who was in his confidence, took care to keep it before him; but he submitted for a while, and concealed his sentiments.' Presently Apelles comes to Corinth, where his friends at court 'made a great fuss about him, being commanders of the peltasts and other distinguished regiments, and set on the young men to meet him with ceremony. And when his advent had quite a scenic effect from the number of generals and soldiers that received him, Apelles, as soon as he arrived, came to the court. But when he was about to enter, according to his usual habit, one of the chamberlains stopped him, saying that it was not convenient for the king to receive him. So Apelles stood astonished and perplexed for a long time, and at last turned about and retired. Then all the rest slipped away from him without disguise, so that he reached his lodging attended only by his slaves. A brief season is generally enough to exalt or humble any man, but most of all those about kings' palaces. For these are like the men on the abacus, according to the player's wish they count a farthing or a talent; so those at

court, according to the king's nod, are either happy or utterly miserable.'[1] Thus we see that the whole atmosphere about Philip's court was one of lying about others, plotting against them, wheedling the king, bullying him—in fact all forms of the worst kind of intriguing, so much so, that Aratus may be considered the best and most honest adviser of the king—Aratus, who would probably have put him to death with tortures, and destroyed the Macedonian kingdom, if it had been in his power, and he had thought it possible to hold together his League without foreign support.

We cannot, then, wonder at the depravation of Hellenism in Greece. The Achaeans, the Aetolians, Philip, and their respective allies, were engaged in aimless and perpetually recurring squabbles,[2] nor does one of the leading men or states seem to suspect the real danger till an obscure Aetolian, Agelaos, in a remarkable speech made at a conference for peace at Naupactus (217 B.C.), points out the folly of these petty wars and the urgent necessity of a combination of Hellenism against the coming crisis, the *cloud in the west*, which would presently grow into a storm.[3] Polybius goes on to explain that this was the moment which first connected eastern and western politics, and that the cities of Greece and Macedon from henceforth made neither peace nor war without reference to the events in Italy. Presently the islanders and Asiatic Greeks followed the same course, and those who quarrelled with Attalus no longer looked to Antiochus or Ptolemy, but some to the

[1] Polyb. v. 26.

[2] In the very remarkable text from Larisa, published by Lolling (*Mitth.* vii. 63), it appears that he took measures to persuade the Larisaeans to give citizenship to the neighbouring Thessalians, in order to increase their own strength. He quotes the practice of the Romans, with their seventy colonies. This proposal met with opposition, but after a second letter (both are quoted in the decree) the Larisaeans acquiesced.

[3] Polyb. v. 104.

Carthaginians and some to the Romans. The meddlesome and ambitious character of Philip, urged on by the unprincipled adventurer Demetrius of Pharos, was for precipitating things, instead of preparing for a strong defence; throwing his whole power on the side of Hannibal, he made, yet not without fatal delays, that famous treaty with the Carthaginian, of which Polybius gives us the text,[1] and which secured for him the vengeance of the great Republic. The treaty (as I have already observed) is remarkable for the pomp of the religious sanctions which encompass it, and which sound strange in the mouth of a king whose admirals by and by set up altars to *Impiety* and to *Injustice*, and cynically violated every obligation of religion.[2]

The real collision was necessarily postponed by the struggles of the second Punic war. The Romans were only able to keep Macedon in check by setting the Aetolians to war with Philip, and supporting them with a fleet, which caused great panic in Greek waters, and indeed behaved with bloodthirstiness and brutality. Allowance must be

[1] Polyb. vii. 8. It is very interesting to consider how far Hellenistic culture had affected Hannibal, the greatest man of the age, who must have had many dealings with Greek-speaking mercenaries. On the one hand, we hear of interpreters being employed by him and by Scipio before Zama, which implies that one at least did not trust himself to discuss important matters in Greek. On the other hand, Cicero's story (*de Oratore* ii. 18) concerning Hannibal attending a Greek lecture on strategy when in exile with Antiochus, and criticising it as a piece of folly, shows that he could understand and speak it, but, as Cicero says, imperfectly. Cornelius Nepos says (*Hann.* 13) that he left several Greek treatises, among which was his letter to the Rhodians about the campaign of Manlius Vulso against the Galatians. But he also says that he had a Greek tutor, who probably composed it for him. This evidence leads me to believe that he found it necessary to know Greek when driven away from home, and compelled to live at Hellenistic courts. In early life it is more than likely that he always worked with an interpreter beside him.

[2] Polyb. xviii. 54.

made for a people in a struggle for existence attacked wantonly by a power not directly concerned in the quarrel.

All these events tended very materially to degrade the Greeks. Peaceful life and contentment were difficult to secure when perpetual raids and revolutions were going on. We feel the result in literature and art. The Athens of that day is strange to us in its insignificance; the Sparta melancholy in its confusion. The once steady and vigorous policy of Macedonia was now directed by a man whose great abilities were chiefly directed to supply gratification for his vices. There was much nominal liberty, but in reality another age of despots had begun.

Ptolemy Philopator did not, like his rivals, live a long life, and so endure the fate of being humiliated and conquered by Rome. Probably his debaucheries shortened his days, and he left his throne to his son, a child of five years old. The circumstances of the accession of this child, Ptolemy V., Epiphanes, are so curious, and give us such an insight into the life of Alexandria at that moment, that I will transcribe the narrative from Mr. Shuckburgh's translation of Polybius.[1]

Three or four days after the death of Ptolemy Philopator, Agathocles and Sosibius, having caused a platform to be erected in the largest court of the palace, summoned a meeting of the foot-guards and the Household, as well as the officers of the infantry and cavalry. The assembly being formed they mounted the platform, and first of all announced the death of the king and queen, and proclaimed the customary period of mourning for the people. After that they placed a diadem upon the head of the child, Ptolemy Epiphanes, proclaimed him king, and read a forged will, in which the late

[1] xv. 26 *sq.*

king nominated Agathocles and Sosibius guardians of his son. They ended by an exhortation to the officers to be loyal to the boy and maintain his rights. They next brought in two silver urns, one of which they declared contained the ashes of the king, the other those of Arsinoe. And, in fact, one of them did really contain the king's ashes, the other was filled with spices. Having done this they proceeded to complete the funeral ceremonies. It was then that all the world at last learnt the truth about the death of Arsinoe. For now that her death was clearly established, the manner of it began to be a matter of speculation. Though rumours which turned out to be true had found their way among the people they had up to this time been disputed; now there was no possibility of hiding the truth, and it became deeply impressed in the minds of all. Indeed there was great excitement among the populace: no one thought about the king; it was the fate of Arsinoe that moved them. Some recalled her orphanhood; others the tyranny and insult she had endured from her earliest days; and when her miserable death was added to these misfortunes it excited such a passion of pity and sorrow that the city was filled with sighs and tears and irrepressible lamentation. Yet it was clear to the thoughtful observer that these were not so much signs of affection for Arsinoe, as of hatred towards Agathocles.

The first measure of this minister, after depositing the urns in the royal tombs and giving orders for the laying aside of mourning, was to gratify the army with two months' pay; for he was convinced that the way to deaden the resentment of the common soldiers was to appeal to their interests. He then caused them to take the oath of allegiance customary at the proclamation of a new king; and next took measures to get all who were likely to be formidable out of the country. Philammon, who had been employed in the murder of Arsinoe, he sent out as Governor of Cyrene; while he committed the young king to the charge of Oenanthe and Agathocleia. Next, Pelops, the son of Pelops, he despatched to the court of Antiochus (the Great) in Asia, to urge him to maintain his friendly relations with the court of Alexandria, and not to violate the treaty he had made with the young king's father. Ptolemy, son of Sosibius, he sent to Philip to arrange for a treaty of intermarriage between the two countries, and to ask

for assistance in case Antiochus should attempt any wholesale violation of existing treaties. He also selected Ptolemy, son of Agesarchus, as ambassador to Rome, not with a view of his seriously prosecuting the embassy, but because he thought that, if he once entered Greece, he would find himself among friends and kinsfolk, and would stay there; which would suit his policy of getting rid of eminent men. Scopas the Aetolian also he sent to Greece to recruit foreign mercenaries, giving him a large sum in gold for bounties. He had two objects in view in this measure; one was to use the soldiers so recruited in the war with Antiochus; another was to get rid of the mercenary troops already existing, by sending them on garrison duty to the various forts and settlements about the country, while he used the new recruits to fill up the numbers of the household regiments with new men, as well as the pickets immediately round the palace, and in other parts of the city. For he believed that men who had been hired by himself, and were taking his pay, would have no feelings in common with the old soldiers, with whom they would be totally unacquainted; but that, having all their hopes of safety and profit in him, he would find them ready to co-operate with him and carry out his orders. . . .

When he had thus got rid of the most eminent men, and had to a great degree quieted the wrath of the common soldiers by his present of pay, he returned quickly to his old way of life. Drawing round him a body of friends, whom he selected from the most frivolous and shameless of his personal attendants or servants, he devoted the chief part of the day and night to drunkenness and all the excesses which accompany drunkenness, sparing neither matron nor bride nor virgin, and doing all this with the most offensive ostentation. The result was a widespread outburst of discontent; and when there appeared no prospect of reforming this state of things, or of obtaining protection against the violence, insolence, and debauchery of the court, which on the contrary grew daily more outrageous, the old hatred blazed up once more in the hearts of the common people, and all began again to recall the misfortunes which the kingdom already owed to these very men. But the absence of any one fit to take the lead, and by whose means they could vent their wrath upon Agathocles and Agathocleia, kept them quiet. Their one remaining

hope rested upon Tlepolemus, and on this they fixed their expectation.

As long as the late king was alive Tlepolemus remained in retirement; but upon his death he quickly propitiated the common soldiers and became once more governor of Pelusium. At first he directed all his actions with a view to the interest of the king, believing that there would be some council of regency to take charge of the boy and administer the government. But when he saw that all those who were fit for this charge were got out of the way, and that Agathocles was boldly monopolising the supreme power, he quickly changed his purpose, because he suspected the danger that threatened him from the hatred which they mutually entertained. He therefore began to draw his troops together, and bestir himself to collect money, that he might not be an easy prey to any enemy. At the same time he was not without hope that the guardianship of the young king, and the chief power in the State, might devolve upon him; both because, in his own private opinion, he was much more fit for it in every respect than Agathocles, and because he was informed that his own troops and those in Alexandria were looking to him to put an end to that minister's outrageous conduct. When such ideas were entertained by Tlepolemus it did not take long to make the quarrel grow, especially as the partisans of both helped to inflame it. Being eager to secure the adhesion of the generals of divisions and the captains of companies, he frequently invited them to drink wine with him; and at these assemblies, instigated partly by the flattery of his guests and partly by his own impulse (for he was a young man and the conversation was over the wine), he used to throw out sarcastic remarks against the family of Agathocles. At first they were covert and enigmatic, then merely ambiguous, and finally undisguised and containing the bitterest reflections. He jibed at him as a mere scribbler of pasquinades, a sackbut-girl and waiting-woman; and spoke of his shameful boyhood, when as cup-bearer of the king he had submitted to the foulest treatment. His guests were always ready to laugh at his words and add their quota to the sum of vituperation. It was not long before this reached the ears of Agathocles; and the breach between the two thus becoming an open one Agathocles immediately began bringing charges against Tlepolemus, declaring that he

was a traitor to the king, and was inviting Antiochus to come and seize the government. And he brought many plausible proofs of this forward, some of which he got by distorting facts that actually occurred, while others were pure invention. His object in so doing was to excite the wrath of the common people against Tlepolemus. But the result was the reverse; for the populace had long fixed their hopes on Tlepolemus, and were only too delighted to see the quarrel breaking out between them. The actual popular outbreak which did occur began from the following circumstances.

[Here the narrative is unfortunately broken and the context lost.]

The first step of Agathocles was to summon a meeting of the Macedonian guards. He entered the assembly accompanied by the young king, and his own sister Agathocleia. At first he feigned not to be able to say what he wished for tears; but after again and again wiping his eyes with his chlamys, he at length mastered his emotion, and taking the young king in his arms spoke as follows: 'Take this boy, whom his father on his death-bed placed in this lady's arms' (pointing to his sister) 'and confided to your loyalty, men of Macedonia! That lady's affection has but little influence in securing this child's safety: it is on you that that safety now depends; his fortunes are in your hands. It has long been evident to those who had eyes to see, that Tlepolemus was aiming at something higher than his natural rank; but now he has named the day and hour on which he intends to assume the crown. Do not let your belief of this depend upon my words: refer to those who know the real truth and have but just come from the very scene of his treason.' With these words he brought forward Critolaus, who deposed that he had seen with his own eyes the altars being decked, and the victims being got ready by the common soldiers, for the ceremony of a coronation.

When the Macedonian guards had heard all this, far from being moved by his appeal, they showed their contempt by hooting and loud murmurs, and drove him away under such a fire of derision, that he got out of the assembly without being conscious how he did it. And similar scenes occurred among other corps of the army at their meetings.

Meanwhile great crowds kept pouring into Alexandria from the up-country stations, calling upon kinsmen or friends to help the movement, and not to submit to the unbridled tyranny of such unworthy men. But what inflamed the populace against the government more than anything else was the knowledge that as Tlepolemus had the absolute command of all the imports into Alexandria, delay would be a cause of suffering to themselves. Moreover an action of Agathocles himself served to heighten the anger of the multitude and of Tlepolemus. For he took Danae, the latter's mother-in-law, from the temple of Demeter, dragged her through the middle of the city unveiled, and cast her into prison. His object in doing this was to manifest his hostility to Tlepolemus; but its effect was to loosen the tongues of the people. In their anger they no longer confined themselves to secret murmurings, but some of them in the night covered the walls in every part of the city with pasquinades; while others in the daytime collected in groups and openly expressed their loathing for the government.

Seeing what was taking place, and beginning to fear the worst, Agathocles at one time meditated making his escape by secret flight; but as he had nothing ready for such a measure, thanks to his own imprudence, he had to give up that idea. At another time he set himself to drawing out lists of men likely to assist him in a bold *coup d'état*, by which he should put to death or arrest his enemies, and then possess himself of absolute power. While still meditating these plans he received information that Moeragenes, one of the body-guard, was betraying all the secrets of the palace to Tlepolemus, and was co-operating with him on account of his relationship with Adaeus, at that time the commander of Bubastus. Agathocles immediately ordered his secretary, Nicostratus, to arrest Moeragenes, and extract the truth from him by every possible kind of torture. Being promptly arrested by Nicostratus, and taken to a retired part of the palace, he was at first examined directly as to the facts alleged; but refusing to confess anything, he was stripped; and now some of the torturers were preparing their instruments, and others with scourges in their hands were just taking off their outer garments, when at that very moment a servant ran in, and after whispering something in the ear of Nicostratus, hurried out again. Nicostratus followed close behind him, without a word, frequently slapping his thigh

with his hand. The predicament of Moeragenes was now indescribably strange. There stood the executioners by his side on the point of raising their scourges, while others close to him were getting ready their instruments of torture: but when Nicostratus withdrew they all stood silently staring in each other's faces, expecting him every moment to return: but as time went on they one by one slipped off, until Moeragenes was left alone. Having made his way through the palace, after this unhoped-for escape, he rushed in his half-clothed state into a tent of the Macedonian guards, which was situated close to the palace. They chanced to be at breakfast, and therefore a good many were collected together; and to them he narrated the story of his wonderful escape. At first they would not believe it, but ultimately were convinced by his appearing without his clothes. Taking advantage of this extraordinary occurrence, Moeragenes besought the Macedonian guards, with tears, 'not only to help him to secure his own safety, but the king's also, and above all their own. For certain destruction stared them in the face,' he said, 'unless they seized the moment when the hatred of the populace was at its height, and every one was ready to wreak vengeance on Agathocles. That moment was now, and all that was wanted was some one to begin.' The passions of the Macedonians were roused by these words, and they finally agreed to do as Moeragenes advised. They at once went round to the tents, first those of their own corps, and then those of the other soldiers; which were all close together facing the same quarter of the city. The wish was one which had for a long time been formed in the minds of the soldiery, wanting nothing but some one to call it forth, and with courage to begin. No sooner, therefore, had a commencement been made than it blazed out like a fire: and before four hours had elapsed every class whether military or civil had agreed to make the attempt.

At this crisis, too, chance contributed a great deal to the final catastrophe. For a letter addressed by Tlepolemus to the army, as well as some of his spies, had fallen into the hands of Agathocles. The letter announced that he would be at Alexandria shortly, and the spies informed Agathocles that he was already there. This news so distracted Agathocles that he gave up taking any measures at all, or even thinking about the dangers which surrounded him, but departed at his

usual hour to his wine, and kept up the carouse to the end in his usual licentious fashion.

But his mother, Oenanthe, went in great distress to the temple of Demeter, which was open on account of a certain annual sacrifice; and there first of all she besought the aid of these goddesses with bendings of the knee and magic incantations; and after that she sat down close to the altar and remained motionless. Most of the women present, delighted to witness her dejection and distress, kept silence: but the ladies of the family of Polycrates and certain others of the nobility, being as yet unaware of what was going on round them, approached Oenanthe and tried to comfort her. But she cried out in a loud voice: 'Do not come near me, you monsters! I know you well! Your hearts are always against us; and you pray the goddess for all imaginable evil upon us. Still I trust and believe that, God willing, you shall one day taste the flesh of your own children.' With these words she ordered her female attendants to drive them away, and strike them with their staves if they refused to go. The ladies availed themselves of this excuse for quitting the temple in a body, raising their hands and praying that she might herself have experience of those very miseries with which she had threatened her neighbours.

The men having by this time decided upon a revolution, now that in every house the anger of the women was added to the general resentment, the popular hatred blazed out with redoubled violence. As soon as night fell the whole city was filled with tumult, torches, and hurrying feet. Some were assembling with shouts in the stadium; some were calling upon others to join them; some were running backwards and forwards seeking to conceal themselves in houses and places least likely to be suspected. And now the open spaces round the palace, the stadium, and the street were filled with a motley crowd, as well as the area in front of the Dionysian Theatre. Being informed of this, Agathocles roused himself from a drunken lethargy—for he had just dismissed his drinking party—and accompanied by all his family, with the exception of Philo, went to the king. After a few words of lamentation over his misfortunes addressed to the child, he took him by the hand, and proceeded to the covered walk which was between the Maeander-garden and the Palaestra,

and leads to the entrance of the theatre. Having securely fastened the two first doors through which he passed, he entered the third with two or three body-guards, his own family, and the king. The doors, however, which were secured by double bars, were only of lattice-work and could therefore be seen through.

By this time the mob had collected from every part of the city, in such numbers, that not only was every foot of ground occupied, but the door-steps and roofs also were crammed with human beings, and such a mingled storm of shouts and cries arose as might be expected from a crowd in which women and children were mingled with men; for in Alexandria, as in Carthage, the children play as conspicuous a part in such commotions as the men.

Day now began to break and the uproar was still a confused babel of voices; but one cry made itself heard conspicuously above the rest, it was a call for the king. The first thing actually done was by the Macedonian guard; they left their quarters and seized the vestibule which served as the audience hall of the palace; then after a brief pause, having ascertained whereabouts in the palace the king was, they went round to the covered walk, burst open the first doors, and when they came to the next demanded with loud shouts that the young king should be surrendered to them. Agathocles, recognising his danger, begged his body-guards to go in his name to the Macedonians to inform them that 'he resigned the guardianship of the king, and all offices, honours, or emoluments which he possessed, and only asked that his life should be granted him with a bare maintenance; that by sinking to his original situation in life he would be rendered incapable, even if he wished it, of being henceforth oppressive to any one.' All the body-guards refused, except Aristomenes, who afterwards obtained the chief power in the state.

This man was an Acarnanian, and, though far advanced in life when he obtained supreme power, he is thought to have made a most excellent and blameless guardian of the king and kingdom. And as he was distinguished in that capacity, so had he been remarkable before for his adulation of Agathocles in the time of his prosperity. He was the first, when entertaining Agathocles at his house, to distinguish him among his guests by the present of a gold diadem, an honour reserved by custom to the kings alone; he was the first too who ventured

to wear his likeness in his ring; and when a daughter was born to him he named her Agathocleia.

But to return to my story. Aristomenes undertook the mission, received his message, and made his way through a certain wicket-gate to the Macedonians. He stated his business in few words: the first impulse of the Macedonians was to stab him to death on the spot; but some of them held up their hands to protect him, and successfully begged his life. He accordingly returned with orders to bring the king or to come no more himself. Having dismissed Aristomenes with these words, the Macedonians proceeded to burst open the second door also. When convinced by their proceedings, no less than by the answer they had returned, of the fierce purpose of the Macedonians, the first idea of Agathocles was to thrust his hands through the latticed door—while Agathocleia did the same with her breasts, which she said had suckled the king—and by every kind of entreaty to beg that the Macedonians would grant him bare life.

But finding that his long and piteous appeals produced no effect, at last he sent out the young king with the body-guards. As soon as they had got the king the Macedonians placed him on a horse and conducted him to the stadium. His appearance being greeted with loud shouts and clapping of hands, they stopped the horse, and dismounting the child, ushered him to the royal stall and seated him there. But the feelings of the crowd were divided: they were delighted that the young king had been brought, but they were dissatisfied that the guilty persons had not been arrested and met with the punishment they deserved. Accordingly they continued with loud cries to demand that the authors of all the mischief should be brought out and made an example. The day was wearing away, and yet the crowd had found no one on whom to wreak their vengeance, when Sosibius, who, though a son of the elder Sosibius, was at that time a member of the body-guard, and as such had a special eye to the safety of the king and the state—seeing that the furious desire of the multitude was implacable, and that the child was frightened at the unaccustomed faces that surrounded him and the uproar of the crowd, asked the king whether 'he would surrender to the populace those who had injured him or his mother.' The boy having nodded assent, Sosibius bade some of the body

guard announce the king's decision, while he raised the young child from his seat and took him to his own house, which was close by, to be taken care of and refreshed. When the message from the king was declared, the whole place broke out into a storm of cheering and clapping of hands. But meanwhile Agathocles and Agathocleia had separated, and gone each to their own lodgings. Without loss of time, soldiers, some voluntarily and others under pressure from the crowd, started in search of them.

The beginning of actual bloodshed, however, was this. One of the servants and flatterers of Agathocles, whose name was Philo, came out to the stadium still flushed with wine. Seeing the fury of the multitude, he said to some bystanders that they would have cause to repent it again as they had only the other day, if Agathocles were to come there. Of those who heard him some began to abuse him, while others pushed him about; and on his attempting to defend himself some tore his cloak off his back, while others thrust their spears into him and wounded him mortally. He was dragged into the middle of the crowd breathing his last gasp; and, having thus tasted blood, the multitude began to look impatiently for the coming of the other victims. They had not to wait long: first appeared Agathocles dragged along bound hand and foot. No sooner had he entered than some soldiers rushed at him and struck him dead. And in doing so they were his friends rather than enemies, for they saved him from the horrible death which he deserved. Nicon was brought next; and after him Agathocleia stripped naked, with her two sisters; and following them the whole family. Last of all some men came bringing Oenanthe, whom they had torn from the temple of Demeter and Persephone, riding stripped naked upon a horse. They were all given up to the populace, who bit and stabbed them, and knocked out their eyes; and as soon as any one of them fell tore him limb from limb, until they had torn them all into shreds: for the savagery of the Egyptians when their passions are roused is indeed terrible.[1] At the same time some young girls who had been brought up with Arsinoe, having learnt that Philammon, the chief agent

[1] See a corroboration of this in the description of Philo *Leg. in Caium* § 19 *sub fin.*

in the murder of that queen, had arrived three days before from Cyrene, rushed to his house ; forced their way in ; killed Philammon himself with stones and sticks ; strangled his infant son ; and, not content with this, dragged his wife naked into the street and put her to death.

Such is the view we obtain into the condition of the Egyptian court, as well as of the character of the Alexandrian populace.

The effects of this affair on foreign politics were also characteristic. The two remaining sovrans of the Hellenistic world, Philip V. and Antiochus III., combined to dismember and appropriate the infant's dominions, and forthwith proceeded to carry out this infamous design. But Philip, who took up the naval part of the attack, found himself confronted by the Rhodians and Attalus, who were determined not to allow the balance of power to be destroyed, and their combined fleets were a match for him. He only succeeded in making enemies all through the Levant by his cruelty and his savage devastation of fair cities and temples, while his ally Antiochus seems to have left him the burden of the war, and did not advance into Coele-Syria and Palestine till five years later.

While Philip was thus playing away all his advantages, spending his energy and his resources in foolish or iniquitous war, Antiochus had obtained the position of a great monarch with a great empire. Had he confined himself to these possessions he would probably have escaped his disgrace and downfall at Magnesia.

I have spent so much time in exhibiting the degradation of the principal Hellenistic courts at this critical period, that I must remind the reader that there were still religion and morals in the world. And first of all, what we know of king Attalus and of the Rhodians in the war just mentioned

shows that they at least had clear notions of duty, and could sacrifice a great deal for the common good. Indeed the panegyric of Attalus which Polybius gives us shows how excellent a prince he was, and how much respected by all the Hellenistic world. I shall defer to a subsequent chapter some interesting details of both the courtesy and savagery shown side by side in the curious moral kaleidoscope which this generation presents to us.

CHAPTER XIX

THE GRADUAL SUBJECTION OF HELLENISM TO ROME — THE CRISIS IN GREECE AND THE SETTLEMENT OF ASIA MINOR

WE have now reached that epoch in the history of Hellenism when the influence of Rome becomes paramount, and the next half-century (roughly speaking 200-150 B.C.) is a mere record of the steps by which the conquest of all the East was accomplished. The principal acts in the drama were four. First, we have what is called the second Macedonian war (200-197), which ended with the battle of Cynoscephalae; secondly, the war with Antiochus (192-190), which ended with the battle of Magnesia; thirdly, the third Macedonian war (with Perseus), which ended with the battle of Pydna (172-168); and lastly, the destruction of Corinth (146 B.C.), which marks the conclusion of all eastern warfare against foreign powers till the rise of Mithradates, who represents the revolt, not of Hellenism, but of Orientalism, against Rome.

It is, therefore, the condition of Hellenistic life during the death-struggle of its independence with which we are now concerned. In one respect our task is easier, because the main facts of the history now belong to Roman as well as to Hellenistic history, and we may presuppose

an acquaintance with the main facts even in the general reader. We have also from this time onward a new authority of great moment in Polybius, whose history, though for the most part only preserved in excerpt or epitome, gives a very clear idea of the politics and manners of his time.

But, unfortunately, it is a time rather of war and of politics than of intellectual and social life, for the constant quarrels of Philip, of the Aetolians, of the Spartan despots, and then the interference of the Romans, involved all the peace-loving states, and so there was in Greece itself great distress and devastation, which at times extended to Asia Minor, and which dealt a blow to Greek life from which it never recovered. The most prosperous states of Alexander's old empire were now Pergamum and Rhodes, which were protected partly by their position, partly by the favour of the Romans, till they were no longer of service against their neighbours. Egypt seems fallen asleep; she is with difficulty able to protect her boundaries from invasion, and owes it to Roman interference that she is not actually conquered by her old rival, Syria, whom she had so often defeated.

It strikes the student of the complicated politics of these times that both Egypt and Syria have become estranged from the atmosphere of Hellenism, and pursue a policy of their own, which might have led to a long period of independence had not Antiochus III. been foolishly induced by the Aetolians to attack Rome in Greece. Philip had indeed persuaded him to join in dismembering Egypt, and had thus caused the Romans to interfere diplomatically in favour of Egypt, which at once accepted the situation, and sought consistently to keep on friendly terms with Rome. We may attribute this far-seeing policy to the wise ministers of Philopator and Epiphanes, especially to

Aristomenes, the tutor of Ptolemy V., and to the larger knowledge Egypt had, through her trade, of the power and resources of Rome.

However, during the earlier years of the period before us, Syria seems, as it were, blocked out from Hellenism by the series of intermediate powers which now come prominently forward—Rhodes, Pergamum, Bithynia; and so much was this the case, Polybius notices, in the next generation, that hitherto Syria had hardly any direct relations with the Achaeans, whereas the very opposite was the case with Egypt.[1] Antiochus Epiphanes was the first Syrian king who cultivated friendly relations with the Greeks[2] apart from the alliances sought in time of war, and if Egypt stood closer to the source of Hellenism, still we know from Egyptian documents that in the days of the present king (Ptolemy Epiphanes) there was a strong national reaction against Greek influences, and that it was by taking the national side that he regained his power over an united Egypt. Plutarch notices, in connexion with the alleged linguistic attainments of the famous Cleopatra, that the previous monarchs of the house of Ptolemy had never even taken the trouble to learn Egyptian, so completely did they identify themselves with Hellenism.

The Rosetta stone gives us the official text of the pro-

[1] Polyb. xxix. 24.

[2] Flamininus compared the army of Antiochus to the dinner of many delicacies to which he had been invited, and when he asked his host how he had managed to command so various a market, was answered that it was all pig-meat, but dressed with various condiments. So, said Flamininus, whatever they may call themselves, they are Syrians (that is slaves). This seems quite confirmed by the picturesque account of the great army defeated at Magnesia by the Romans, at the cost of only a few hundred men (Livy xxxvii. 40). It was essentially an oriental host, though there were Cretan and Galatian auxiliaries employed.

clamation of Epiphanes as king of Egypt (*ἀνακλητήρια*), nine years after his accession. The young king was then fourteen years old.[1] Polybius alludes several times to this proclamation, on the occasion of which all the friendly powers, including the Achaeans, sent deputations of congratulation. The king had already been betrothed to the daughter of Antiochus the Great with her promised dowry from Coele-Syria and Judaea; he was married to her when he was seventeen. Polybius regards the whole ceremony as an arrangement among his Greek ministers, after they had got rid of the dangerous mercenary leaders, the Aetolians Scopas and Dicaearchus, who were assuming too great importance, Scopas indeed outrageously refusing to obey the royal summons.[2] He tells us that Aristomenes and Polycrates were the men who got rid of them and retained the power. But he seems quite ignorant of the important facts disclosed by the Rosetta stone.

This famous document, which afforded the key to the reading of the hieroglyphs, was found, as is well known, by the French, in throwing up defences at Rosetta, but after the battle of Aboukir was taken by the English and sent home to the British Museum. It turned out to be (like the inscription of Tanis[3]) a decree drawn up by the priests assembled in conclave, this time for the formal proclamation of Ptolemy Epiphanes as king, in the ninth year of his reign and the fourteenth of his age, when he was considered to have attained his majority. It is dated the 27th March, 196 B.C., or the day after the coronation. As we have already learned the style of these documents from

[1] I have printed the whole text with a commentary in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* pp. 316 *sq.*

[2] *ὃ πάντων ἐστὶν ἔσχατον* Polyb. xxviii. 35.

[3] Above, p. 347.

previous specimens, the reader will be satisfied with a compendium of the sense. But I may point out how completely the whole ceremony, proclamation, and decree has become Egyptian, and how little there is of Hellenism in it beyond the Greek version appended to the Egyptian texts. This the very string of titles at the opening will show.

'In the reign of the young (Ptolemy) successor to his father, the lord of crowns, the glorious, that has established Egypt, and is pious towards the gods, superior to his adversaries, that has set up the life of men, the lord of periods, like Hephaestus the Great, like the Sun, the great king of the upper and lower country, offspring of the gods Philopators, whom Hephaestus has approved, to whom the Sun has given the victory, the living image of Zeus, son of the Sun, Ptolemy, the everliving, beloved of Ptah'—then follow the priests and priestesses who mark the year, the month, and day of the month. 'The decree: All the priests who assembled at Memphis for the proclamation of King Ptolemy, the god Epiphanes, the blessed, etc. etc., being assembled in the temple of Ptah, proclaimed: WHEREAS the king has set up and honoured all the temples, and spent great sums in the prosperity of the country, and has remitted taxes and debts, and relieved the priests of their annual homage at Alexandria, and re-established the state of things existing in the first year of his father [who had laid oppressive burdens on them], and ordered those of the military class who had returned, and of the others who were disloyal in the days of the revolt, to come home and remain on their lands; and sent out large armies to protect the frontiers of Egypt, and besieged Lycopolis, the stronghold of the rebels, and took it, destroying all the impious within it, signally executing the leaders whom he brought to Memphis, who had revolted under his father, etc. etc. IT IS DECREED by

the assembled priests to increase greatly the divine honours awarded to the everliving king, etc. etc., and to place an image of him in every temple, to be called the image of Ptolemy, the avenger of Egypt, with daily sacrifices hereby specified. Moreover, it shall be set in a shrine of wood gilt, and in order that it may be distinguished from others, it is to be adorned with asps and crowns according to the following fashion'—here follow the 'heraldic' details—'and his birthday is to be a feast, and there is to be a priest of Epiphanes,' etc.

Imagine a Greek sovràn having such a protocol composed for him, or its being composed first in Greek, as Letronne insists! The *political* importance of this document, which seems a mere address of congratulation, has only lately been made clear by M. Revillout. He shows that sundry national deliverers (in fact Mahdis) had sprung up under the tyranny of Philopator, and that the declaration of the divinity of Epiphanes, and of his therefore legitimate sovranty, was intended by the court as a religious counterblast to their claims, which was no doubt obtained by large concessions to the priests.[1] Such, however, was the ceremony of installing a new king in Egypt, with executions and cruelties as well as with benevolences and festivities. Let us return to Greece.

As soon as Philip was crushed at Cynoscephalae, the leading part in Eastern politics was taken up by the Aetolians, who all through their history show a far larger policy and wider interests than the Achaeans. Their league was spread over many coasts and islands, reaching even to the Hellespont. They had intimate relations with Egypt for a long time, seeing that they were constantly supplying mercenary

[1] Cf. *Rev. égypt.* i. 4, 153.

generals and armies, and that a foreign queen had founded one of the many towns called Arsinoe there. They seem from the first to have had close relations with Pergamum, and it was through them that Attalus was brought in contact with the Romans when all three powers joined against Philip. They played no unimportant part in the campaign against Philip, and boasted all over Greece that it was they who had won the battle of Cynoscephalae, while Flamininus had stood praying with his hands raised to heaven. It was their disappointment at the settlement made by the Roman that first showed itself in loud complaints that he was bribed, and ultimately in the stirring up of the war of Antiochus with Rome. They were the one power in Greece which showed a stubborn resistance, and gave the Romans real trouble to conquer them. The Aetolian commander, instead of figuring like Perseus in the Roman triumph, escaped from the dungeon at Rome, where he was kept in preparation for it, and when surrounded by his pursuers committed suicide. As the mediation of the Aetolians was often offered and accepted by other states when at war, their fairness as umpires was recognised.

Thus the historical position of this league, directed by a set of mountaineer chiefs, who had gained wealth and experience in foreign service, is quite at variance with the picture drawn by Polybius of its character and policy. He says that Aetolians were not punished, and were tolerated in Greece, because consistent injustice and dishonesty escape far better than single acts of this kind. He says they were only desirous of plunder and personal aggrandisement. He has left us no hint of what policy they pursued, or what condition they would have maintained in Greece had they succeeded in persuading or forcing the rest of Greece to join them. We get not a single glimpse into their home

life and habits beyond the wealth and luxury of Thermus. They produced, however, not only good speakers and literary men at Alexandria, but, as we see in the case of Agelaos of Naupactus, good politicians, who saw perfectly the folly of petty border wars and the necessity of a strong and honest union among Greeks. If they had left us a historian, we should perhaps rate them far higher than the cautious and trimming Achaeans, who sought to obtain by diplomacy what the Aetolians won by arms, and who after all attained their highest ideal in Philopoemen, a man far more of the Aetolian than the Achaean type.

But neither league ever produced a really great statesman and general. We have already seen what Aratus was. The sketch we have of Philopoemen is that of a hardy mountaineer delighting not in formal athletics, but in sport, in agriculture, and above all in war, thus showing the modern features of Hellenism as against the athletic habit of Aratus. Philopoemen was, moreover, a good tactician and brave; but as a politician, quite useless, or worse than useless. He could not brook opposition, and preferred to spend the periods when he was out of office in mercenary raiding through Crete, when he should have been guiding the policy of his country. He was very vindictive, resenting the anger of his city at his self-imposed and sulky exile, and avenging himself upon the Spartans by a cruel and bloody execution and the overthrow of their constitution. In fact he was the man who first took Sparta, and abolished the laws called those of Lycurgus.[1] Thus, if we omit

[1] It has never been discussed by historians, why Sparta remained so long uncaptured. Epaminondas failed to take it, owing to the difficulties of keeping his allies together. But when Philip, after Chaeronea, and Alexander after the sack of Thebes, marched into Peloponnesus, and in both cases the Spartans sullenly refused to join the league under Macedon, why did neither of them make an end of this opposition? I

the love of personal adornment and the rapacity shown by most of the Aetolian clephts, we have in Philopoemen the same type of man—a sort of generous enthusiast with a talent for war and for leading men, but with no head for politics, in fact a Garibaldi. But unfortunately the Victor Emanuel of those days, Antigonus Doson, did not live to control him, and so his democratic and socialistic tendencies were constantly breaking out with his bad temper, much to the disturbance of the usual timocratic management of the league.

The most striking feature of the period from Cynoscephalae to Pydna (197-168 B.C.) was, of course, the rapidly altering relations of the Hellenistic world to Rome. In the struggle against Philip the Romans found it easy to pose as liberators, as phil-Hellenes, as honourable and grave benefactors of Greece. Even the very generous, and perhaps unwise settlement made by Flamininus[1] after his victory, by which Greece was left ungarrisoned in the face of an attack from Antiochus, corroborated that opinion. Hence there must have been many who looked upon the Romans at first as the saviours of true Hellenism.[2]

believe it to have been a deliberate policy of both, not to interfere with this free breeding ground of their best mercenary soldiers. So long as they avoided extreme measures, they were always sure of excellent men, and officers whom other Greeks readily obeyed, for their mercenary battalions.

[1] Cf. *Mitth.* vii. 64 on two letters of Philip V. quoting the procedure of the Romans to the people of Larisa; cf. also *BCH* vi. 378 on the inscription of Narthakion in which Flamininus's settlement is referred to. His letter to the town of Kyretiae is in *CIG* No. 1770, and also in Viereck's tract on the *Sermo Graecus* of the Roman official documents.

[2] Here is the character of the Romans drawn in the first book of the Maccabees, a sober and trustworthy history (viii. 1 *sq.*): 'And Judas had heard the name of the Romans, that they are mighty in strength, and are well esteemed among all who ally themselves to them, and that

There was a very difficult question to settle concerning the Greek cities on the Hellespont, which had long been

whosoever come unto them they establish friendship with them, and are mighty in strength. And it was told him concerning their wars, and their valour which they showed against the Galatians, and that they had conquered them and brought them under tribute; and what things they did in the land of Spain to gain possession of the mines of silver and of gold which are there. And how they had conquered every place with their counsel and their patience, even if the place were very far from them; and of the kings that went up against them from the ends of the earth, how they crushed them and smote them mightily, and the rest pay them yearly tribute. And Philip and Perseus, kings of the Citieis, who were lifted up against them, they smote in war and conquered them. And Antiochus the Great, who came against them in war, having 120 elephants and horses and chariots and a great army, he too was overthrown by them. And they took him alive and made him and those that were kings with him to pay a great tribute, and give hostages. And the Indian country, and Media and Lydia, of their fairest possessions, taking them from him they gave them to Eumenes the king. And how those of Greece counselled to come and attack them, and the plan was made known, and they went against the Greeks, and fought against them, and there fell of the Greeks many wounded, and their wives and children were taken captives, and their land was taken and their strongholds destroyed, and they were enslaved up to this day. And the rest of the kingdoms and islands, as many as resisted them, they smote and enslaved. But with their friends and them that trusted in them they kept friendship, and they had the power over kingdoms far and near, and as many as heard their name were afraid of them. Whomsoever they desired to help and make them kings, these did reign; but whomsoever they would they set aside, and they were greatly exalted. And yet among them all no man put on a diadem, nor was clothed in purple to be adorned with it. And they made them a council chamber, and 320 of them took counsel every day upon all that concerned the people that it might be well ordered, and they entrust one man to rule them for a year, and to be lord of all their country, and all obey the one, and there is no envy or jealousy among them.'

This picture of the Romans, as they first impressed the East, is very interesting, especially as they very soon changed both in character and in the estimation of the world. This is apparent even in the second Maccabees, which is of later date and different tone.

under the rule of the Ptolemies, but which had been taken by Philip. The kings of Egypt being old allies of Rome, the first move of the senate was to order all these cities, which had been *sub dicione Ptolemaei*, to be restored to him. But then there arose many earnest protests from these cities, setting forth their right to liberty and autonomy according to the phil-Hellene policy of the Romans. A most interesting decree from Lampsacus[1] gives us some details of this diplomatic discussion. Smyrna and Alexandria Troas seem to have been the other cities most active in the matter. Lampsacus sent an envoy not only to L. Flamininus, commanding the Roman fleet under his brother, but to Rome and even to Massilia, whose inhabitants were akin to those of Lampsacus (both from Phokaea), and close friends of the Romans. The Massaliots were not only persuaded to plead for the liberty of Lampsacus at Rome, but also addressed a public letter to the Tolostoagian Galatae in Asia, whose brethren still dwelt in Gaul, and in relations to Massilia, that the claims of Lampsacus might be supported. This action was rewarded with success, as we know from extant historians.[2] The pressing danger to Lampsacus at the moment was not from Egypt, but Syria, for Antiochus III. was already advancing towards Europe.

The character of T. Flamininus, as drawn by Plutarch in his *Life*, shows us clearly what the enlightened Roman of that day was.[3] He was trained in speaking Greek by residence at Tarentum, and no doubt a Roman noble at that moment found a knowledge of Greek as valuable as our officials now find speaking Turkish or Arabic when there is

[1] Cf. Lolling's art. in *Mitth.* vii. 96 *sq.*

[2] Cf. Polyb. xviii. 45; Appian *Syr.* 2; Diodorus 620, whom Lolling cites.

[3] Scipio Africanus was the model of these men; cf. the evidence collected in Saalfeld *Hellen. in Latium* pp. 167-168.

a crisis in the East. In another generation or two Greek became more fashionable at Rome than French is among our higher classes, and though the Greeks found great difficulty in learning Latin the Romans seem to have been able to learn a practical use of Greek well enough. But in Flamininus's day it was still an exception, and therefore a distinction. We see this plainly enough in the man's vanity. He was far more anxious to pose as one of the Aeneadae and the patron of Greece than to guard the interests of Rome.[1] We find too that his interests were rather too promiscuous, extending in some curious way even to the tyrant Nabis, whom he refused to punish personally, or to dispossess. However, with all his faults, his vanity, his restlessness in going about Greece with intercession, with advice, with sentimental compliments, he appears to us a Roman really civilised and softened with Hellenistic culture. Had such men—Scipio Africanus, Aem. Paullus, Scipio Aemilianus—been able to control affairs, the Roman interference in the empire of Alexander would have been very differently accepted. But even they must in the end have learned the mistake of allowing the Greeks freedom to carry on raids and border wars, democratic revolutions and aristocratic reactions, attended with slaughter and confiscation, and if ever they had insisted upon internal quiet, the so-called 'freedom of all the Greeks' would have been

[1] Plutarch cites for us two epigrams in which he celebrated his victory (c. 12), in both of which he calls the Romans Αἰνεάδας. Cf. the letter to king Seleucus from Rome, offering alliance if he left their ancestral Ilion free! quoted by the emperor Claudius; see Suetonius *Claud.* 25: *Iliensibus, quasi Romanae gentis auctoribus, tributa in perpetuum remisit, recitata vetere epistula Graeca senatus populique R. Seleuco regi amicitiam et societatem ita demum pollicentis, si consanguineos suos Ilienses ab omni onere immunes praestitisset.* Cato in his *Origines* derived the Romans from Greece, as Dionysius Halicarnassus tells us.

violated in sentiment, and there would have arisen a bitter anti-Roman feeling in Greece.

But there were far different Roman types, and far more common, than T. Flamininus. There were, of course, downright ruffians like his brother L. Flamininus, whose outrages caused indignation even at Rome, and led to his expulsion from the senate, though we hear from Plutarch that the sympathy of the Roman mob was with him, when he appeared after his degradation in the 'top gallery' at the theatre. This man's conduct happened to come under the elder Cato's notice, and, as its censure gratified an antipathy in politics, was exposed and punished. But how many rude and brutal Romans committed outrages with impunity! There were again characters like Q. Marcius Philippus, who went through the Hellenistic world with cynical frankness, promoting scrapes and quarrels, and embroiling the various states with one another and with Rome, by a system of deliberate lying. Even Livy (xlii. 47) comments on this so-called new diplomacy, which was gravely censured by the older and more respectable senators. But these were in the minority, and Q. Marcius was supported and honoured. It is an interesting fact that this man, so rash as a soldier, so treacherous as a peacemaker, was sixty years old and very stout when he was first sent to Greece, though still so active in mind and body.[1]

And there were other haughty Romans, who, if they disdained deceit and lying, also disdained to recognise the constitutional rights of the Greeks, and posed as insolent masters,[2] when they were officially mere commissioners of

[1] Livy xliv. 4, speaking of Perseus: *neque ipse [Perseus] certamini adfuit, cum Romanus imperator maior sexaginta annis et praegravis corpore omnia militaria munera ipse impigre obiret.*

[2] Such was the Caecilius who attempted to convoke the Achaean League upon his own authority (Polyb. xxii. 13), and probably the

the senate. It was indeed, as Mommsen says, the age of commissions. Parties of three or of ten Roman senators were perpetually travelling about the Levant, bringing orders from Rome, making reports, deciding in disputes; and yet they hardly ever settled anything. The Hellenistic world was kept in a chronic state of seething and irritation, destructive to home life, to culture, to letters. No public quarrel could be settled without sending ambassadors to Rome, and then the answers of the senate were always feeble, halting, and often contradictory to previous decisions.

The causes of this extraordinary weakness in governing on the part of a strong nation—and a nation with no feebleness when the vital interests of Rome were concerned—were three, which we may recognise in the politics of our own day. In the first place, the interests of the subject or semi-subject nations were subordinated to party politics and the ambitions of important men at Rome. Flamininus's infamous brother was attacked, and defended, upon party grounds; the incompetent and perhaps corrupt brother of the great Scipio was appointed consul, and afterwards prosecuted and banished, for party reasons. The bonds of family, or of policy, in both cases overrode considerations of justice. Secondly, there was a sentimental vein in the policy of Rome, which, though an amiable weakness, produced very mischievous effects. It arose from that vanity of posing as cultivated, and as aristocrats in civilisation, which appears in the very first Roman communications with Greece, and in the anxiety to rank as descendants of Aeneas and colonists from Ilium.[1] This

Octavius who was murdered in Apamea with open acclamations, and with the impunity of the murderer. This latter case will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

[1] The Acarnanians, applying to the Romans for protection (Strabo x. 2, 25), urged that they alone of all the Greeks had taken no part in

vulgar mawkishness about Greek liberties, this anxiety to redress historical wrongs, to regard the Greeks as a down-trodden people, whom they had a mission to liberate, was not indeed intensified by the remorse that their own fore-fathers had been the oppressors. Luckily the old Greeks had conquered the Trojan ancestors of Rome, and so the pangs of conscience, which now so deeply afflict a Gladstone and a Morley for the sins of their ancestors towards Ireland, could hardly affect a Marcius or a Quinctius.

But the sentimentality was there, and was constantly producing effusive declarations, often mischievous concessions, always immoral encouragements to the Greeks to ventilate their grievances. For thirdly, in curious contrast to this excess of sentiment, there was a complete absence of real sympathy between the Romans and their subjects. No people were more thoroughly wrapt up in themselves, satisfied with their own greatness, and dull to understand the wants and wishes of any clever and sagacious nation. The quick-witted and the sensitive are sure to be misunderstood by the narrow and the dull. Thus the Romans were always asking, What do you want? How can we satisfy you? and the Greeks (including those of Asia Minor) were so various in their demands that there seemed no possibility of getting a definite answer.

Of course the cry for Home Rule was the most obvious. Let then all the Greeks be free and independent. This was the solution of T. Flamininus. What was the result? The Aetolians did not receive out of the spoils of the victory over Philip what they thought their due. They had possessed towns in Thessaly which Philip had taken, and

the siege of Troy! the town of Tenea, close to Corinth, escaped destruction by joining in time the Romans, and referring its origin to Tenedos (viii. 6, 23)! two comical examples.

which were now declared free and independent. What did they do? They called in the nearest foreign power available, Antiochus the Great of Syria, and made him pose as the 'liberator of the Greeks.' This astonishes Plutarch,[1] who says, *how could they want a liberator when they were already free?* But the Aetolians wanted license. They wanted the right of private wars and of plunder. They wanted the right of extending their league to the unwilling North. So there resulted another great war.

When the Aetolians were crushed and reduced to impotence, but not to peace, from terrible and bloody internal disorders, the same problem rose again as regards Peloponnesus. The Achaeans ruled most of it, and seemed a respectable and orderly government. They were allowed to extend the sway of the league over the whole peninsula. What were the results? First they tried to secure the island Zakynthus (Zante), and were greatly offended when the Romans said no, and advised them to confine themselves within the bounds of the Peloponnesus.

But even within these bounds what happened? There were two states in Peloponnesus, Sparta and Messene, which had long been opposed to the league, which had suffered greatly at its hands in former days, and which were therefore bitterly opposed to the Achaeans in traditions, in sentiment, and in policy. They could no more believe in the justice of government by the Achaean League than the Protestant or loyal Catholic people in the north and east of Ireland can believe in just government under the 'National' League. The latter aims at ruling all the island, as Aratus and his party aimed at ruling the whole Peloponnesus. But had not Philopoemen been one of the main factors in the victory of Sellasia, which deprived Sparta of her noblest king? So

[1] *Life of Titus Fl.* 15.

when a party in each of these states arranged the junction with the league, this formal union was the direct cause of dreadful revolutions, which ended in the disruption of the league and the complete ruin of Home Rule in Greece. The Achaean and the anti-Achaean parties within Sparta and Messene were as violently opposed as are the Roman Catholics and the Protestants in Belfast, and behaved as we might see the Belfast parties behave if there were a Home Rule Parliament established in Dublin. Revolutions and murders, followed by bloody executions on the part of the Home Rule government, led to continual missions and complaints at Rome, with feeble attempts on the part of the senate to make peace, to moderate party violences, and yet to interfere as little as possible. Once they tried the policy of absolute refusal to interfere, when more bloodshed and disorder broke out. Another time they saved the Spartan landlords, who were condemned to death by the Achaean government, and forbade sentences of death against Spartans, while they ordered that Sparta should still obey the quasi-National League. Thus the senate pleased nobody, and offended everybody, among all the warring parties, especially by the policy of non-intervention.

Need we wonder then that a party arose in the various states whose open object was to abolish all this turmoil, this confusion, this violence, and substitute for it the direct government of Rome? These Unionists have a very bad name in the history of the period. Some of them, like the Epirote Charops, were downright snobs, who had left their country to live at Rome, learn Latin, and Roman manners, and who had doubtless come back with a supreme contempt for everything Greek or national. Others calculated upon becoming Roman agents, and making money of their sycophancy. They were mere base flatterers, who traduced

the popular party, acted as spies and informers, and justly earned popular detestation. Such is the account of them we hear in Polybius.

But if the nationalist press of Ireland were to survive as the only evidence of what has happened there in our own days, what sort of picture would posterity have of the Unionists? And though I should be very sorry indeed to put Polybius on a level with the publicists of modern Ireland, yet he was a busy politician for the Home Rule party of his day, and shared in their anger and their grief. There must have been many respectable people who felt that in Roman protection only could they trust for the security of their lives and property, and that the loss of political liberty of the imperial kind was worth enduring for the sake of personal liberty and protection from the license of lawless men around them. They had before them as examples the many cities of Asia, which had long prospered under the suzerainty of some great power, nor did they anticipate the dreadful commercial tyranny with which the Roman capitalists crushed all rival mercantile enterprise out of the world.

From what we know of the national party even through their respectable members, like Polybius, we see in them much violence; we see too a strong tendency to misstate and colour facts. Thus he tells us[1] how three envoys went to Rome, being practically represented by one of them on the Unionist side, Callicrates, who said what he liked and totally misled the senate, while the other two members, who bore the great names of Aratus and Lydiades, the old leaders of the national party, not only did nothing, but were even perfectly ignorant of all that was going on, so that the traitor was elected Commander of the Achaean League on

[1] xxiv. 10-12.

his return! Is this credible?[1] or can we believe that if the Romans had retired completely from the Greek world there would have been peace and happiness there? If this had been possible, it would have been under such a ruler as Antigonus Doson, or as Attalus, not under a crowd of well-matched and rival polities. But how precarious was the popularity of Eumenes II., Attalus's successor, appears from the interesting discussion before the senate, which I shall quote hereafter.

The crisis of all these things came with the war against Perseus. For nearly twenty years the senate had been arbitrating and settling and conceding in the Greek world, and yet at the end of that time, when the son of the Philip whom they had conquered, and who had striven to enslave Greece, rose up against Rome, all the sympathies of the Greek world, of all Hellenism, went with him. The Romans were indeed able to isolate Macedonia diplomatically. Nobody dared to refuse them material support and auxiliary troops. But the campaign, which was long and arduous, must have made it quite plain that the Greek troops were fighting against the grain. From non-combatants too in the towns the Romans must have experienced plenty of scowls and muttered curses, and the philo-Roman party could tell plenty of stories about secret missions and hopes, of delight at the Roman defeats, and longing that the Macedonian might win. The Romans had striven for twenty-five years to liberate and to pacify the Greeks, and their attempts had turned out a complete failure. The only remedy was either to abandon the eastern empire they had acquired, or to make a clean sweep of the national party both in Mace-

[1] The account of this embassy must have been obtained by Polybius from the younger Aratus. It is hard to acquit the patriots of having told some desperate lies to cover their own apparent inaction.

donia, in Epirus, and in Greece, and so reduce the troublesome peninsula to peace.

In the case of Macedonia, a conquered foe, it was easy enough. The ancient laws of war justified the Romans in carrying off the whole of the better classes to Italy, and so leaving the country without leaders, without intellect, without capital, and moreover separated into four distinct divisions without right of commerce or connexion.

In the case of the Achaeans, who had formally supported Rome in the war, and had carefully abstained from every public act or vote against Rome, the matter was more difficult. It was a decided stretch of prerogative, nay, an act of tyranny, to establish a court of inquiry into opinion, and to punish secret sympathy with Perseus. So when Xenon offered to be tried anywhere, even in Italy, confiding in the justice of the national cause, the Romans jumped at the legal excuse, and carried 1000 leading Achaeans to Italy.

This great act of deportation, accompanied by large executions and sales into slavery of Macedonians, Epirotes, and Aetolians, was the death-blow of the Greek section of Hellenism. The old cities of Greece, once the leaders of the race, were long since effete, and produced no men of mark. The only possibility of regenerating the country lay in the outlying peoples, the mountaineers, the fresher and even semi-Hellenic neighbours, who showed so much vigour in the preceding century. All the cream of this population, those who had gained traditions, amassed capital, acquired culture, were now swept away.

The whole tendency of the anti-Roman movement in Greece and in Greek-speaking lands was strictly democratic, and often socialistic. Nowhere do we hear of the propertied classes siding against Rome. In the Achaean

troubles, which ended in the tragic destruction of Corinth by Mummius, nothing is clearer than this socialistic and democratic complexion of the rising, for war it can hardly be called. The leading patriots, such as Diaeus and Critolaus, who made wild speeches against Rome, and hounded on the mob to violences against both the moderate party and the Unionists, were so disreputable that we can hardly dignify them with the name of enthusiasts. They seem to have given and taken bribes, and to have used their power for personal gain as well as to carry out their policy. They did not even show decent personal courage, or any determination to die in battle for their country, so that the last bloody act in the drama, before the reeking curtain of the smoke of Corinth hides the stage, has no redeeming grandeur, such as that which ennobles the fall of Carthage in the very same momentous year. It is manifest that the Hellenistic democracies, had they been victorious, were worthless to carry on the work of Hellenistic culture.

We have no great writer to picture to us the condition of Greece on the outbreak of the last revolt, but even the tame historians of the day grow eloquent when they describe the gloom and the terror, the anguish and the despair, which pervaded Peloponnesus at this crisis. Those who had anything to hope for, anything to lose, did not know which of the two awful alternatives to prefer—the tyranny of the mad patriots, with a desperate mob behind them, who did not hesitate to execute with horrible tortures the advocates of moderation; or the conquest of the ruthless Romans, so stern and bloody in its thoroughness. On the whole, those who escaped execution or slavery found in the Roman conquest the advent of peace, though it entailed upon them political annihilation and commercial ruin.

The political conditions of the Greek peninsula were so

peculiar, and they came so directly into conflict with Rome, that it seemed desirable to anticipate somewhat in describing this crisis, which shows in an acute form what happened gradually or existed chronically elsewhere. It was chiefly owing to Roman interference that the Hellenistic world, once a great unity, is at this time separated into three groups of powers, easily enough distinguished by their relative geographical proximity to Rome. First we have the Hellenic peninsula, including Macedonia, whose fortunes we have discussed. Then we have the coasts and islands of Asia Minor, comprising politically Pergamum, Rhodes, and the crowd of Greek cities in various relations of dependence to these powers. Thirdly we have the remoter kingdoms of Pontus and Bithynia, Syria and Egypt, which the Romans never included in their sentimental phil-Hellenism, but always treated as oriental foreigners.

Perhaps this was right. Quite apart from the greater distance of these kingdoms from Rome, and the impossibility of embracing them at once under her sway, there had been, as I have already explained, a distinct reaction of eastern nationalities upon the less thickly sown seed of Alexander's sowing. Yet still the life of independent Hellenism lasted longer the more it lay beyond the reach of Rome, until the days came that all the world drifted together into its one great empire. In this chapter, however, we may add to what has been said about Greece a word on the condition of Asia Minor, or the remainder of what the Romans regarded as real Hellenism.

Polybius has given us a very interesting account of the scene at Rome when all Asia came to congratulate the senate on the victory over Antiochus, and also over the Galatians (189 B.C.) Amid the many embassies from

free towns and from dynasts who only sought to obtain by politeness the permission to stay as they were, there came two of graver import — King Eumenes II., who had suffered great danger and loss in the war, being besieged by Antiochus, and with difficulty rescued from destruction; and the Rhodians, whose fleet had been of capital importance in staying Antiochus, as well as in securing the sea communications of the Roman legions. What rewards were these useful allies—thorough Greeks, too, from the very country that had sent Aeneas to Italy—to receive?

When the day of audience came, the senate first called in Eumenes, and invited him to state candidly what he thought the senate ought to grant him. But he said that, as the Romans themselves would advise him to show no grasping or greed in asking for favours from any one else, so now, when he came to receive benefits from them, he thought it better to leave his own case and that of his brothers entirely in their hands. And when one of the older senators stood up and encouraged him not to be afraid but to speak out, as the senate meant to please him as far as was possible, he still stuck to his point. So after some delay the king retired, and they remained to discuss what should be done. They then resolved to call in Eumenes again, and press him to tell them for what he had come to Rome, since, of course, he himself must know what was best for his affairs and how things stood in Asia. So he was recalled, and this being explained to him, was compelled to make a statement. He opened by saying that as regarded himself, he would abide by his former reply, and leave the whole matter to the senate; but there was one point, his relations with the Rhodians, on which he would venture a few remarks. For they were come for no other purpose than he was, both seeking to advance their respective countries and promote their own interests; yet for all that their arguments might produce a false impression upon the senate. This he would briefly explain. The Rhodians would tell them that they came neither to ask anything for themselves nor to detract from the king's claims, but merely to plead for *the*

liberty of the Greeks dwelling in Asia. 'This they will urge not as a favour to themselves, but as your duty and consistent with your former policy. Now this argument, so specious in words, will be found to have in reality a very different effect. For if the cities are liberated, as they propose, it will result in an enormous increase of their power, while mine will be simply ruined. For the name of liberty and autonomy, and the knowledge that this is your policy, will alienate from me all those which have been subject to me, and bring them over to Rhodes. Believing that they owe the Rhodians their liberty, they will in name become their allies, but in fact do whatever the Rhodians bid them. So you will exalt many of those who were hostile to you, and abase me, a true and hereditary friend!'

He proceeded to recount the acts of his father and himself, and their sufferings through their consistent philo-Roman policy. Finally, he declared that if the Romans chose to hold part of Antiochus's former dominion in Asia themselves, that would please him best, but if not, no one had so good a claim as he had.

But why not liberate those who were enslaved by Antiochus? If they had not joined him in war against you that might be fair, but now it is surely better to help your friends of long standing than to confer favours upon your enemies of but yesterday.

Thus we see King Eumenes struggling against the shibboleth of 'Liberty and Home Rule for all the Greeks.'

Accordingly when the Rhodians entered they commenced by regretting that circumstances compelled them to oppose a very friendly sovran. But yet they must do so, for to them and their country this only appeared worthy of the Romans that every Greek city in Asia should recover its liberty and that autonomy which is precious to every heart. Of course this could not be the policy of Eumenes and his brothers, for a monarchy from its very nature must hate equality, and seek to bring as many cities as possible under its sway. Hence they thought that their mission should have as much weight with the senate as Eumenes's, not from their personal influence being greater, but from their arguments being sounder. If, indeed, it were not possible for the Romans to reward him in

any other way than by handing him over the cities which should be autonomous, the Rhodian embassy would feel perplexed, for it would be a dilemma between neglecting a true friend and reversing the whole course of the noble and enlightened Roman policy in the East. 'But if you can satisfy both requirements, where is the difficulty? for, as in a splendid banquet, there is plenty and to spare for everybody. Suppose you give him Pisidia and Lycaonia and Phrygia about the Hellespont, and the Chersonese in Europe, his power would be increased tenfold. [These were either inland provinces, or sea-coast under the influence of Byzantium and Heraclea, and therefore outside the Rhodian confederation.] What object can you Romans have in war? You want no power, for the gods have given you all the world. You want no money, for you have it in abundance, and money is a possession which all can acquire; but honour and the glory of doing what is right is your only possible gain in the matter. Accordingly the most splendid of all your deeds is the freeing of the Greeks,' etc. etc.

The result was of course a compromise. Both the Rhodians and Eumenes got territory, and the Greek cities already under the king were left to him. Those which had been under Antiochus were made independent.[1]

Thus the next fourteen years were a season of great prosperity for both these powers, in spite of their rivalries and conflicting interests.

We can now add from the inscriptions of Pergamum, published in the account of the excavations,[2] something more concerning the inner condition of this polity under the Attalid dynasty. The relation of the kings to the state is most curious. They receive divine honours after their decease; they have, while living, divine honours like the

[1] Polyb. xxi. 18 *sq.*

[2] The collecting and editing of these texts is by Max Fränkel, and constitutes the 8th volume of the series, but can be obtained separately. Cf. also *BCH* v. 378 on the Aetolian participation in the newly founded Nikephoria at Pergamum.

Ptolemies; and yet they rule in a state called a democracy, of which all the public decisions are decrees of the βουλή and the δῆμος. The proposals to this assembly of citizens come from officers called στρατηγοί, and these are appointed by the king, who is constantly thanked as a public benefactor by formal decrees of the people over whom he ruled. The brilliant period for the Attalid empire reached from the battle of Magnesia (190 B.C.) to that of Pydna (168 B.C.) For Eumenes II., succeeding in 197 B.C., had suffered, as I have just told, during the war with Antiochus great hardship and loss; his fleet had been invaluable to the Romans; he had even commanded a wing of the Roman army at the battle of Magnesia. He was accordingly magnificently rewarded; he practically obtained as his territory inner Asia Minor, so far as that land had belonged to the Syrian kingdom, and he used his power not only in prosecuting successful wars against Prusias of Bithynia and Pharnaces of Pontus, and the Galatians, but in adorning his capital with those famous monuments, which have even now yielded such valuable remains.[1] His active help restored Antiochus Epiphanes to his kingdom; his munificence built stoas and temples in various Greek towns; he must have been quite the most important person in the East till the day when the Romans no longer wanted his assistance. The very curious constitution of this new state, which had no real past,[2] seems to have been a compromise such as that which existed in

[1] Cf. Strabo p. 624.

[2] An inscription (Fränkel No. 156) tells us that all the inhabitants of Tegea in Peloponnesus were made honorary citizens, because Pergamum had been founded by the mythical Auge, the mother of the Mysian Telephus. There were many other legends invented at Pergamum for the purpose of proving not only the antiquity of the city, but its relation to Rome through the hero Aeneas and his followers.

the cities of Cyprus, which had a council and assembly, which even issued coins, but nevertheless were ruled by kings;[1] is it possible that even Augustus had this model consciously before him when he reconstructed the constitution of Rome under his own sovranty? These curiosities of Hellenistic statecraft will, I trust, soon be better understood by the discovery of further texts. They are here only mentioned as a very successful experiment in combining the democratic aspirations of citizens with the good direction and the splendour of royalty. But the whole development of this kingdom must be treated in a special monograph.

There was a great change in 167-166 B.C., when the power of Perseus was crushed, and these second-rate kingdoms or leagues were no longer required. Here again we have from Polybius an account of how the Rhodians fared, how the senate resented the attempt at mediation which Q. Marcius Philippus had induced Rhodes to make, and was on the point of destroying this ornament and glory of later Hellenism.[2]

[1] Cf. Diodorus xvi. 42 quoted in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 85.

[2] 'For the Rhodians, having learned the answer given them by the senate immediately after the battle of Pydna, and seeing the anger and threats of the senate, sent a fresh embassy under Astymedes and Philophron. When these saw, both publicly and in private, the suspicion and estrangement of the Romans, they fell into the deepest despair. And when one of the consuls, mounting the rostra, was urging the populace to war against the Rhodians, then, being quite beside themselves at the danger of their country, they went so far as to put on mourning, and no longer used arguments or urged their friends, but besought with tears that nothing irreparable should be decreed against their country. After some days, when the tribune Antonius introduced them, and dragged from the rostra the consul who was pressing for war, both envoys made speeches, and having sung their swan's song, as the proverb goes, received such an answer as to free them from their general apprehension of a war, while as to special com-

The Roman policy as regards Eumenes was if possible more infamous. He had given the senate no handle for interference. It was only the sure conviction at Rome that every Greek state round the Aegean hated their victory and sympathised with Perseus which set the senate to punish them all, and destroy their power by using the old cry of liberty, and inducing their subjects to revolt from them. Eumenes was patient and prudent, and as his brother Attalus at Rome was loyal to him, and would not accept the suggestions made to him to set up as a rival sovran, this once favoured, now injured, king kept his capital and his crown, and left it to his successor.[1] In both these great cities, therefore, in spite of the commercial ruin of Rhodes, we may conceive that there was still some intellectual and artistic life, and some leisure to attend to other subjects than party politics. The so-called free cities of Asia Minor for a long time kept their population and their trade, and even after the cruel exactions of the Roman civil wars they recovered their prosperity, and were the ornament of the Roman Empire.

plaints the senate answered them severely and angrily. The drift of it was this, that but for the interference of a few of their friends at Rome, they knew very well what treatment they thoroughly deserved.'—Polyb. xxx. 4. I shall quote the sequel of the passage in another connexion. We have now recovered from Teos an inscription telling us how in this second division of spoil King Kotys of Thrace laid claim to the city of Abdera on his coast, an old colony of Teos. Two Teian ambassadors at Rome, by dint of waiting upon Roman nobles, joining in the herd of their clients, and other such troublesome work, obtained a refusal of Kotys's demand, and secured the liberties of Abdera. Cf. *BCH* iv. 54 *sq.*

[1] I have cited the affair of the brother usurping crown and wife when he heard that the king was dead, above, p. 258.

CHAPTER XX

DECAYING HELLENISM IN SYRIA—ITS COLLISION WITH JUDAISM

WHILE Greece and Asia Minor were thus engaged in a sort of death-struggle with the domination of Rome, the outlying kingdoms, Syria and Egypt, had for a long time to suffer no more than the interferences of diplomacy, often indeed dictatorial, on the part of the Republic. The series of Syrian and Egyptian kings proceeds as of old. Seleucids and Ptolemies have their accessions and proclamations. If we consult a mere work on chronology, there is no trace to be seen that the glory was departed from them. It is not till the settlement of the East by Pompey and of Egypt by Caesar that these ancient royal houses are formally swept away.[1] But at the time of the subjugation of the Greek world they had not yet sunk low in their internal splendour and their culture, even though their power in the scale of nations was irrevocably impaired. We have some glimpses of the court and doings of Antiochus Epiphanes which are not without curious interest, and the Alexandria of this period, the home of Aristarchus, has left its literary

[1] There were Seleucids, wealthy hereditary princes of the province Commagene, down to the time of Vespasian. Clinton, however (*Fasti* iii. 343), will not believe that this was the old royal family.

mark for ever upon the world. To these homes of yet brilliant though waning Hellenism we may now turn our attention.

The kingdom of Syria, from the battle of Magnesia onward, is not only reduced in power but subject to a new influence. The reigning king is obliged to send a prince to Rome as hostage for his own, and still more, his successor's loyalty. Antiochus the Great was obliged to send his eldest son Antiochus to Rome in this way, and it practically ruined this prince's chance of succession, for in those days of slow news, how could he expect to obtain a throne when he could not hear of its vacancy for a month or two, and then could not reach home for a month or two more? Obviously, therefore, the hostage-prince was not the 'heir apparent.' In the present case the younger son, Seleucus Philopator, succeeded and reigned without dispute, and it was considered a generous thing that after eleven years he offered in exchange for his elder brother his own child Demetrius, doubtless to prepare the youth in Roman politics, and to make him Roman friendships. There were plenty of Greeks at Rome to teach him Hellenistic culture, and the society of the greatest nobles and strongest politicians in the world could be found nowhere else. There must have been quite a collection of these royal hostages at Rome, and to judge from what Polybius tells us, they lived a pleasant and luxurious life there, just as exiled princes have been petted and courted in the highest English society of our own day. They sported and caroused with Claudii and Cornelii, and if they did not share in the serious studies of their patrician friends, they were probably leaders in all sorts of pleasure. The senate made them allowances in the way of residence and respect, and probably compelled their parents (if they were not liberal of their own accord)

to make them a handsome allowance in money, though I can find no evidence on that point. Their households were, of course, made up of Greeks, and probably they seldom took the trouble to learn Latin. Such was the life which Antiochus Epiphanes had lived from the age of thirty to that of forty-five, when he was liberated, and returned home. He must have had for companions not only Romans but many oriental princes—some ordered to Rome as already described, others sent there voluntarily to learn the ways and politics of the senate. This latter education had come to be regarded as a sort of necessity for princes, and no state in the Hellenistic East seems at this time to have neglected it.

Thus Diodorus (Excerpt. lib. xxxi.) tells in an interesting chapter on the Hellenistic kings, Ariarathes III., IV., and V. of Cappadocia, that the former (III.), married to a sister of Antiochus II. (Theos), left his kingdom to the next (IV.), a mere youth, married (192 B.C.) to the daughter of Antiochus the Great, an ambitious princess called Antiochis. Having at first no children, she suborned two sons, but confessed this crime to her husband when she had a real heir. It was then thought best to send away the supposititious sons, for fear of their possible claims upon the throne, the one, 'with suitable appointments' (*μετὰ συμμέτρου χρείας*), to Rome, the other to Ionia—evidently to the two great centres of politics and of culture.[1] Diodorus goes on to say that the legitimate heir, Ariarathes V. (at first called

[1] The youth sent to Ionia, apparently to Priene, where he kept his money in bank, was called Orophernes, and afterwards seized the throne of Cappadocia, but was too rapacious and tyrannical to be tolerated in place of the humane and popular Ariarathes V. It is possible that this Orophernes suggested the Holophernes of the romance called the Book of Judith (in the Apocrypha). However, Orophernes was an old name in the royal family of Cappadocia.

Mithradates), also got Hellenic training, and turned out not only an excellent prince but a devoted son. When he succeeded (163 B.C.) 'his general culture and his patronage of philosophy were such, that from henceforth Cappadocia, hitherto consistently ignored by the Greeks, became a fit place for educated men to live in.' This was evidently a case of Hellenisation similar to that we have already mentioned as being carried out by Nicomedes of Bithynia, when he founded his capital Nicomedia. But the Cappadocian kings seem to have made the mistake of choosing an inland and inaccessible capital, Mazaca, over one hundred miles from the Cilician gates, and still more remote from the Euphrates and the Black Sea. Mazaca was in fact a mountain fortress in the centre of the kingdom.[1] It is for this reason that the Hellenising of Cappadocia failed to make it a centre of civilisation like Antioch or Nicomedia.

No stranger character, however, occupies this period than Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes), and it is very regrettable that we have no account of his life at Rome, for it is hard to conceive so active a mind without some scope to work off its energy. We do not even hear that he spent his leisure in hunting, like the prince who came to relieve him as hostage. But it is hard not to suspect that if there were some young patricians like the Scipios and Aemilii, there were many more who lived in revelry and in vulgar dissipation, to whom an oriental prince would be a capital boon companion, and possibly an *arbiter elegantiarum* in the more refined vices of the East.

If Epiphanes spent his life in this way, it did not sap his energy, though it possibly inflamed in him that vein of madness which all the historians notice. The catalogue of

[1] Strabo xii. 2. There seems no mention anywhere of this Cappadocian capital except here.

his acts within his twelve years' reign is very remarkable. He was almost the second founder of Antioch, so greatly did he enlarge and beautify it. He was the first Syrian king who cultivated friendly relations with the Greeks, apart from seeking their alliance (as his father had done) in war. Polybius tells us that when the Achaean League was discussing the propriety of intervention in the quarrel between this king and the Egyptians, it was urged by Lycortas that the friendly acts of Egypt towards Greece were innumerable, whereas this was the first Syrian king with whom they had any intimate relations. But no one doubted his liberality or his courtesy. Let us hear what Livy, probably copying Polybius, says of him. After telling what we have in our fragments of Polybius, concerning the king's strange caprices, his sudden and unexpected liberalities, his changes of temper, his apparent insanity, Livy proceeds[1]: 'But in two great and honourable ways his mind was truly royal, in gifts to the [Greek] cities and in the cult of the gods. He promised he would surround the city of Megalopolis with a wall, and actually gave the greater part of the cost in money; he undertook to make a magnificent theatre of marble at Tegea; for the Prytaneum of Cyzicus, where those who obtain the honour dine at the public expense, he gave gold plate for one of the tables. To the Rhodians he gave not indeed one such remarkable gift, but many, according as their needs required them. Of his munificence to the gods the temple of Olympian Jove at Athens, the only one on earth designed in accordance with the greatness of that deity, may serve as a witness; but Delos also he adorned with splendid altars and a crowd of statues, and at Antioch the magnificent temple of Capitoline Jove not only had its ceiling gilded, but all the walls were covered with thin plates of gold.

[1] xli. 21.

Many other promises of rich gifts he did not fulfil, owing to the shortness of his reign. He exceeded all his predecessors in the splendour of his public shows, owing to the number and style of the Greek artists employed; with a display of gladiators, after the Roman fashion, he rather terrified than pleased a public unused to such a sight; but by degrees, first only going as far as drawing blood, he ultimately accustomed men to enjoy this kind of game in its extreme form, and excited a love of arms in the youth by importing gladiators from Rome.'

His principal wars were with Egypt. Whether it be really true that Eulaeus the eunuch, the Egyptian prince's guardian, provoked the war, or that Antiochus was clever enough in diplomacy to have it so believed, the Egyptian claim upon Coele-Syria and Palestine, which Antiochus the Great had taken after the battle of Panion, was renewed, especially as their revenues had since been promised as a dowry to the Syrian princess Cleopatra I., now queen-mother in Egypt. The arguments *pro* and *con* on this interesting question are given by Polybius,[1] and are very instructive on the international diplomacy of the day. But Antiochus was far more than a match for the Egyptians. He had long since, when a mere youth, taken an active part in the great battle of Panion against the mercenary forces sent into Syria by the king of Egypt. He now won another victory near Gaza, and marched in triumph into Memphis. I need not relate the details of his several campaigns to Egypt, in which he took all the lower country except Alexandria, and this was on the point of falling into his hands when, with the news of Pydna, came the Roman embassy of Popilius Laenas, who commanded him, within his famous circle, to decide on the spot for war or peace with Rome. But for

[1] xxviii. 20.

the victory of Pydna neither would the Roman have ventured to display his insolence, nor would Antiochus have ceded his prize. He decided very sensibly. Had there been no Roman army out on war footing, he might have risked offending the senate, for it was not easy to move so large and cumbrous a power as that of Rome, where laziness, and the consciousness of real strength, often led to a policy of carelessness and contempt even for insults. But at this moment a victorious army, raised to its highest efficiency by a stern general, and eager for more plunder, lay ready in Eastern Macedonia; the incoming consul would desire to pluck his laurels, so it was life or death for Syria. The campaign of C. Manl. Vulso with his army through Asia Minor after the battle of Magnesia showed plainly what would have been the fate of Antioch and its ruler. It is even possible that a Syrian campaign was already arranged, and that the king's submission and personal popularity at Rome precluded this more lucrative expedition.

By submitting at once Antiochus Epiphanes secured his army and elephants, and even profited by the persistent negligence of the Romans, when he raised his forces to an amount distinctly forbidden by the treaty made with his father Antiochus the Great. It was on his march to and from Egypt that he passed through Jerusalem, and committed those excesses of which we hear so much from Josephus. But I will postpone for a moment his Jewish policy. On his return to Antioch, he organised at Daphne, by way of rivalry to the pageant of M. Aem. Paullus at Amphipolis, an immense feast, of which Polybius has left us a description.

The king, hearing of the games held by Aemilius Paullus (at Amphipolis, to celebrate his victory over Perseus), determined to outdo Paullus in splendour, and sent embassies to the cities announcing the festival he would hold at Daphne,

so that there was great eagerness among the Greeks to attend it. The opening of the festival was a procession, arranged in this wise. 5000 stalwart men in Roman armour with mail corselets led the way; then 5000 Mysians. Next came 3000 Cilicians, dressed as light-armed troops, with golden crowns, then 3000 Thracians and 5000 Galatae. 20,000 Macedonians followed, and 5000 with brazen shields, others with silver shields, and then 240 pairs of gladiators. Behind these were 1000 Nisaean steeds and 3000 Syrian, in trappings of gold and silver.

There follow the details of a whole Macedonian army, as Alexander had modelled it—46,000 foot and 5500 horse, winding up with thirty-six elephants.

The rest of the procession is hard to describe, says Polybius, without going into great detail. There were 800 ephebi with golden crowns, 1000 well-fed oxen, 800 elephants' tusks. The number of images could not be told, for of all the gods and demons named or worshipped among men, and besides of heroes, there were statues brought along, some gilded, some dressed in gold-wrought garments, and to all these the myths that belonged to them, according to written tradition, were attached in splendid adornment (?). Then followed images of Night and Day, of the Earth and of Heaven, of the Dawn and the Noon-day. As to gold and silver ornaments, we may mention that the slaves of Dionysius, one of the Peers and chief Secretary, walked with silver ornaments, each of which weighed 1000 drachms, 600 royal pages came like unto them, and 600 women, sprinkling unguents from golden pitchers, etc. etc. The whole public were also engaged in seeing contests of skill, gladiatorial combats, or hunting in the king's preserves, and fed at tables spread for 1000 or 1500 at a time, and supplied with the most precious unguents of nard, cinnamon, iris, etc. [This taste for dispensing unguents was Antiochus's great hobby.] But he insisted on riding up and down on a cheap pony, ordering the procession himself, so that if you took off his diadem, no one could guess it was the king who was acting the part of a second-rate servant. And at the banquets he arranged the guests himself, and changed them about at table, sitting down and again starting

up, drinking healths, standing and joking with the musicians. Nay, as the feasting went on, he was even carried in by the mimes muffled up, and when a tune was struck up, jumped out of his muffling undressed, and danced with the mimes jocular and low dances, so that all the guests got up ashamed and left the banquet, and all that went to the festival wondered, on the one hand, at the splendour and the good appointments and arrangement of the king and his court, but on the other, looking at the man himself and his conduct, how such ability and worthlessness could combine in one and the same human nature.

The historian tells us repeatedly that these mad fits were not the king's usual habit, that he was a man of brilliant talents and high qualities. He was so popular with the Roman aristocracy, and so agreeable to the Roman embassies who went out to inspect his doings, that the senate could never obtain a report against him from their envoys.[1] I fancy him in his splendid capital, a sovran like the ex-Khedive Ismael, unscrupulous and tyrannical, but with large ideas as to the adoption of Western culture, spending enormous sums on the improvement and adornment of his palaces and cities,[2] oppressing his subjects with taxes, but

[1] Cf. Polyb. xxxi. 5.

[2] It is curious and melancholy that hardly any traces are now left of the great architecture of the Seleucids. Antiochus IV. added a whole quarter to Antioch, and the descriptions of this and the other great cities of Syria prove clearly enough that the Seleucids delighted in splendid buildings. It is owing to the terrible series of earthquakes which visited Syria for several centuries that all these monuments of Seleucid splendour have disappeared. The only building of this period which still remains in a condition to inform us of its style is the palace of Hyrcanus in the deserts of Judaea, which is referred to below, in the account of his life. Here we see very distinctly Hellenic influences mixed with local Semitic style. We must imagine the architecture of such cities as Antioch to be much more purely Greek. But the specimen of Jewish Hellenism is deeply interesting and instructive. According to Schürer, the remains of Gerasa, east of the Jordan, are considerable

showing to visitors from the great kingdoms of Europe such splendid hospitality, that they at least would raise no accusation against him. Such was the account which English travellers gave of the Egypt of twenty years ago. Such, no doubt, was the account circulated privately at Rome among higher circles about Epiphanes—'Leave him alone, he is too mad to do any harm, and Daphne is such a charming place to visit. Let us have an embassy of inquiry every year, but on no account report against him.' His policy was to carry out far more thoroughly than his predecessors had done the Hellenising of his kingdom, and so, in his violence, he overdid the thing, and produced at least one national reaction which has perpetuated its deadly hatred of the king, and has profoundly modified the history of the East.

The most interesting of all the developments of Hellenism, in many ways, is that which took place in Judaea, because here, as in Egypt, the culture brought in by the Macedonians and planted in Syria came into contact or collision with another civilisation of old standing, of great dignity, and possessing both a literature and a moral position distinctly its own. Here too, most fortunately, we have some evidence, not only of the results in religion and in politics, but also in literature, so that we can go into this question with considerable detail. By a curious coincidence, just as the history of Western Hellenism occupies that gap which our classical education permits between the history of Greece and the history of Rome

enough to make another exception. There are still one hundred pillars standing there, which seem to have belonged to the colonnade of its main street, and which therefore belong distinctly to the type of Antioch and Alexandria. They are said to stand next, among Syrian ruins, to those of Baalbec, Palmyra, and Petra (cf. Schürer *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes* etc. ii. 103).

in Greece, so the history of Jewish Hellenism comes mainly into that passage between the Old and New Testaments which is, by a sort of common consent, omitted from ordinary school teaching. The so-called *Apocrypha*, which contains most of the evidence, is not printed in our ordinary Bibles. Judas Maccabaeus is known to most people as the subject of an oratorio by Händel. There is, therefore, a certain freshness about this period which should commend it to those who are already well versed in the earlier and later history of the Jews. Let me add that though the later part of the literature produced in this epoch is excluded from the Canon, there are two books which belong to the same spirit or school, and which may therefore be put under contribution—Daniel, at least in its Hebrew portions, and Ecclesiastes, which is now generally recognised as the work not of Solomon or his age, but of some philosopher living in the decadence of the nation.

Beginning, however, with the political condition of the Jews, when Alexander the Great arrived in Palestine, we naturally inquire how it was that he treated them with such favour. I lay aside the details of his visit to Jerusalem told with such circumstance by Josephus (*Antt.* xi. 8, 5), but hold to the fact that from its very foundation Alexandria was the privileged home of a large population of Jews induced to settle there by Alexander's favours.

We are nowhere told why the conqueror favoured this people so exceptionally, but a brief consideration of its antecedent fortunes and character will show such strong reasons in the nature of the thing, that we may venture to supply the answer refused us by antiquity.

From the days of the Captivity (if not even earlier), when great numbers of Jews had been deported by the Chaldaeans, and settled all through Mesopotamia and Media, as far as

Ragae (the Caspian Gates), their nationality ceased to be an affair of territory, and became a mere bond of blood and religion, so much so, that while Jerusalem recovered its place and always maintained its dignity as the metropolitan city, scattered portions of the nation, known from early times under the title of *diaspora* in Greek,[1] became far the most wealthy and numerous. Their position along the great high-roads of trade from the far East to Egypt gave them exceptional advantages, and after the refounding of Jerusalem, when they began to send yearly offerings to the temple, their envoys, meeting at the capital, must have established a general understanding as regards trade-interests among all the scattered communities of the 'chosen people.' It is easy to see how they would turn their national misfortune into profit. Finding the importance of friends, who spoke a common language, in every foreign city, they opened their eyes to the advantages of this scattered existence, and spread along coasts and islands, perhaps in the wake of the Phoenicians, so that in Alexander's day they were already a widely-known race.

But hitherto their main extension had been eastward, through the cities of the Assyrian and Persian Empire. They had relations of religion and of business with outlying communities as far as the Indian limits of that territory. It was therefore hardly possible that Alexander, who was going to attack the Persian king in a strange country, with no charts, no fixed line of communications, no experienced intelligence corps, should not seize the opportunity of conciliating the only race which was scattered through all the Persian cities, and in constant communication with the sea-board of Palestine. They could tell him the distances, the size of the towns, the produce and resources, the difficulties of

[1] In Hebrew *Niddach*; cf. Deut. xxx. 4, Ps. cxlvii. 2.

mountains and rivers, and whatever else was necessary to make his campaign an orderly invasion and not a mere knight-errant's adventure.[1] It is more than likely that they offered to serve him as guides, though here again I can find no evidence. But, as we know, the names of guides are seldom recorded, while the intelligence department, which depends upon them, takes all the credit.[2]

Thus then the Jews obtained favour, and were invited to form a part of the population of Alexandria, retaining their own customs, ruled by their own officials, and in some respects ranking as citizens of Alexandria, not as a subject race, like the native Egyptians. Alexander had already experience of them, that they formed communities in other foreign towns, and were, as they now are, good and loyal citizens, while maintaining their distinct nationality and religion. They on the other hand must have understood, better than Alexander, the commercial prospects of the new city. This brilliant foundation was closely copied by

[1] In those days what Philo says (*Leg. ad Caium* 31) was probably strictly true. 'For every year sacred envoys bring great store of gold and silver to the temple, gathered in the provinces, traversing difficult unused or unfinished roads, which they consider highways because they hold them to be the way to holiness.'

[2] I find a trace of this policy in the statement of Josephus (*Antt.* xi. 8, 5) when he narrates how Alexander conceded to the high-priest at Jerusalem various privileges, among others that of remission of tribute every seventh (Sabbatical) year. 'But when they requested him that he would allow the Jews in Babylon and Media (about whom he must now have heard for the first time) to abide by their national institutions, he readily promised to do what they claimed. And when he said to the people (of the Jews) that if any of them were willing to serve in his expedition, on the condition of abiding by their national customs and living in that way, he was ready to take them with him, many were content to serve as soldiers with him.' There is also a dream of Alexander quoted, in which the high-priest appeared to him in Macedonia, and invited him to Asia, declaring *that the high-priest himself would be his guide*. This invention is most significant.

the Diadochi, so that in Antioch, and we may assume in Seleucia on the Tigris, the Jews were admitted to similar privileges. So satisfactory indeed did they turn out as new citizens of Hellenistic capitals that Antiochus the Great imported a large body of them to the cities of Asia Minor [1] in order to secure the allegiance of these provinces.

For the first century after Alexander's death Palestine was under the sway of the Ptolemies, and though there were apparently cases of high-handed oppression when the Egyptians visited Jerusalem, the country was on the whole at peace and happy, so much so that Polybius tells us in the quarrels of Egypt and Syria the Jews were strongly on the side of the Egyptians. It is profoundly to be regretted that Josephus has given us no hint of any sources but one, from which he drew the interesting sketches of the first three Ptolemies in the twelfth book of his *Jewish Antiquities*. For though the source which he does quote concerning the origin of the Greek version of the Old Testament is manifestly an unsafe one—the still extant pseudo-Aristeas—no one who has studied the early history of the Diadochi will fail to appreciate the real knowledge of the early Ptolemies shown throughout Josephus's narrative.

Thus he describes Ptolemy Soter as a rude conqueror, who carried away many captives from all parts of Palestine to Egypt, but nevertheless so far obtained the confidence of the nation as to make treaties with them and secure their allegiance on the terms ordained by Alexander, thus inducing many to settle voluntarily in Alexandria.

[1] Hengstenberg says *à propos* of bilingual inscriptions (Phoenician and Greek) found at Athens, *CIG* i. No. 894, that he can prove these instances to belong to a general habit of the Jews, that of adopting Greek equivalents for their Hebrew names when settled in Hellenistic cities. The inscriptions in question give both names, viz. Artemidorus and a Phoenician equivalent.

The reign of Philadelphus, on the contrary, is described (after 'Aristeas') as one of great and continuous favour to the Jews. Apart from the legend of his admiration for their sacred books, and his entertainment of the LXX., he is reported to have liberated all the enslaved Jews throughout Egypt, paying 460 talents at the rate of 120 drachmas per head. This gives us 18,400 as the number of the captives, but the historian adds that the money was obtained even for infants by the owners, who interpreted the king's decree in the broadest way.[1] There seems to be some basis for this story. I note the price of ransom ($1\frac{1}{5}$ minae) as a liberal allowance in these countries, for on a subsequent occasion[2] Nicanor and Gorgias, the Syrian generals, offer to sell their captives at ninety for the talent, viz. 66 drachmas apiece, which was intended as a very low price to induce slave-merchants to follow their expedition. The reader will remember that at the siege of Rhodes[3] the ransom reached 5 minae or 500 drachmas. But of course Greek slaves and Jewish were held in a very different estimation.

I wish we could say something as definite concerning the precious offerings of Philadelphus to the temple at Jerusalem, of which Josephus gives us a detailed description. Either these details were invented by an earlier author,[4] or they

[1] *Antt.* xii. 2, 3. [2] 2 Macc. viii. 11. [3] Above, p. 106.

[4] The letter of the pseudo-Aristeas, intended to magnify the importance of the Jews in Egypt, is extant, but of unknown date and authorship. It has only recently (1868) been critically edited by M. Schmidt in Merx's *Archiv* Heft iii. Earlier editions (Hody, Van Dale, and in Havercamp's Josephus) were both very inaccurate and very inaccessible. The course of recent criticism, starting from the researches of Lumbroso, has tended rather to rehabilitate the authority of this much-decried author. His knowledge of the Egyptian court seems good, and we now know that the books of Moses were translated as early as the fourth Ptolemy. I am therefore disposed to give credit to his general statement, though many details are of course fabricated.

must have been very early and trustworthy, for the temple treasures were all plundered by Antiochus Epiphanes about 168 B.C., especially the shew-bread table, which is the chief thing described by Josephus. If the account be therefore genuine, it must either have been made at the time of the gift, or it must have been seen among Antiochus's spoils at Antioch. Josephus's description (xii. 2, 9) is most minute, and I may observe that while the ornament, all worked in gold and precious stones, contained both Greek and Egyptian patterns—the egg and dart along the edge, the lily or lotus for the legs—there was a careful avoidance of any human or animal forms in all the design. This, which Josephus does not specially note, seems to imply that the design was really intended for its peculiar place in the Jewish temple.

Whatever may be the truth of all these details, the friendly relations of Egypt and Palestine at that time may be accepted as well attested. And although the kings of Syria had as yet not made good their claims on Palestine, we are told that the first Seleucus, on founding Antioch, had copied the model of Alexandria, and had given the Jewish settlers special privileges, whether equal to those of Macedonians and Greeks, as Josephus says, or inferior, we can hardly say, but real enough to give them the title of citizens of Antioch. Josephus mentions as a curious piece of evidence for his statement that the managers of the gymnasia at Antioch, according to ancient custom, made the Jews a money allowance for oil, as they objected to rub themselves with oil of heathen manufacture.

But the very mention of gymnasia, and Jews practising in them, suggests the topic to which this historical retrospect is the proper introduction. How far had the spirit and the ways of Hellenism succeeded in leavening the Jewish people?

We had seen above (p. 226) that Syria was of all oriental lands the most quickly and thoroughly Hellenised, and this fact could not be without effect on the neighbouring Palestine. Many Greek settlements were made through the country,[1] and are constantly alluded to by Josephus, who, moreover, tells us (in a story) that those who refused to pay their annual tribute had their land taken from them, and given to colonies of soldiers, sent to occupy it. This then was the pay of the reserve force, or the retiring pension accorded to faithful mercenaries, and this was the nucleus of the population of many a town. Meanwhile the higher classes were everywhere courting the favour of Lagidae and Seleucidae, and constantly paying visits to their capitals for political and financial purposes. More especially, when the farming out of the taxes or tribute took place, which seems to have been done by a sort of auction, all the important people of Syria and Palestine, during the period before us, adjourned to Alexandria, and there spent their time intriguing, flattering, bribing, to obtain the favour of the king through his officials. 'Aristeas' mentions, *à propos* of the LXX., that there was a special officer appointed by the king to acquaint himself with the manners and habits of foreign nations, so that distinguished strangers coming on embassies should have their convenience consulted and

[1] Cf. 2 Macc. vi. 8 τὰς ἀστιγείτονας πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας. This question has been fully discussed in Stark's *Gaza*, and in the 2nd volume of Schürer's *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes*. It appears that these new settlements were not right through the country, but either along the sea-coast (Ptolemais, etc.) or else up the east side of the Jordan (where there was even a Decapolis, or group of ten cities) reaching to Damascus. Of these Gerasa, Scythopolis, etc., may be mentioned. They each had a senate and assembly, and counted their years by an era of their own, dating from their Macedonian foundation. In these cities Jews or Syrians were settled as non-Hellenic citizens, but with some privileges.

their prejudices not violated. They were supplied with the diet they preferred, and were enabled to carry out the practice of their religion. Nothing shows us more clearly than this—surely not invented—detail how completely cosmopolitan was the Hellenism of Alexandria. Further particulars are disclosed in the history or legend of the adventures of Josephus, son of Tobias, related by his namesake in the twelfth book of the *Antiquities*.

We may place this story towards the end of the first Euergetes's reign,[1] when, as already observed, that king, though not an old man, showed a curious decay in energy, and only appears in the tale as a good-humoured, easy-going sovran, willing to be imposed upon by vigorous and unscrupulous servants. This Josephus was evidently a clever man, but no devout Jew. He was often at Alexandria, and kept large sums there in the hands of an agent, who was a trusty slave of his own. He even got drunk at feasts there, and attempted an amour with a dancing-girl, but was deceived by his brother, who substituted a daughter, so that Josephus had an illegitimate child by his niece—a frequent Greek connexion, but abhorrent to Hebrews.

This illegitimate boy, Hyrcanus, was a son worthy of his father, and supplanted all his elder brethren in the affections of the old man. Then came a day when the birth of an heir to the Egyptian crown was announced, and all the magnates of Syria, as of other countries, prepared to send embassies of congratulation. Whereupon Josephus, who was too old to go, asked his sons which of them would undertake this duty. The elder ones declined, 'saying that they were not

[1] Cf. the discussion of the date in Stark's *Gaza* 412 *sq.* I have given the whole narrative in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* pp. 216 *sqq.* Many critics regard it as a pure fable.

polished enough in manners to mix in such society,'[1] and advised that Hyrcanus should be sent. He at once assented, and said he would do it economically, only asking 10,000 drachmae for his expenses, but added, after a pause, that his father ought to give him an order on his banker in Alexandria for money to buy presents for the king in that great mart. The old man considered that about ten talents ought to suffice for this, but, trusting the good sense and economy of his son, gave him an order on his agent Arion in Alexandria, a man who had some 3000 talents of Josephus's money under his hand, and who paid the Syrian tribute at once on the fixed day, without waiting for remittances. Meanwhile the elder brothers had sent letters to Alexandria to compass Hyrcanus's disgrace and destruction. When he arrived he went to his father's agent Arion, who asked how much he wanted. He demanded 1000 talents, and when the long-tried and trusty servant sturdily objected and refused to give him more than ten talents, and that for the king's present, adding sundry protests that his father's hard-earned money must not be spent in dissipation, the youth forthwith had him put in prison—we may presume by the Jewish authorities in Alexandria, to whom he showed his father's general order. Complaints of this conduct reached Ptolemy, who sent to inquire what it all meant, and why the son of his old friend Josephus had not presented himself at court. Hyrcanus replied that as he would not enter a temple without an offering to the god, he could not appear before his father's benefactor without a gift, and that he had punished his slave by the same right that the king controlled his subjects.

So he got the money, and was asked to dine at court, pending the birthday solemnities. There the chamberlains

[1] xii. 4, 7 *πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας συνουσίας ἀγροικώτερον ἔχειν φησάντων.*

or masters of the ceremonies put him at the foot of the table, or in the lowest place, so that the bones left by other guests were piled up on his table, or before him. The account is here not very clear, and it seems very strange that such a thing should happen to any guest at Ptolemy's table. But I cannot agree with the majority of critics, that such a detail was invented. The king's jester made a joke about it, and told the king that as Hyrcanus had bared all these bones so his father Josephus had stripped the Syrians. When the king laughed and asked Hyrcanus how all the bones got heaped up before him, he replied that the rest, like dogs, had devoured both meat and bones, while he, being a man, had only eaten the meat and cast away the bones. This answer was applauded by the king, and Hyrcanus's position at court secured. He then ascertained from the household what presents each of them, and the embassies, were going to make, and finding that they ranged from ten to twenty talents in value, outbid them all by buying a hundred boys and a hundred girls for a talent each, and presenting them to the king and queen. When the king asked what he could do for him, he claimed nothing but letters to his father and brethren justifying his conduct. But the king's letters were of no avail, for nothing could reconcile his family to the loss of the money. So, after a pitched battle with his brethren, in which two of them were killed, he retired beyond Jordan, and built himself a splendid rock-fortress,[1] where he lived by plundering the Arabs. He committed suicide when the

[1] This fortress is described with some detail by Josephus (xii. 4. 11) in a way which reminds one of the famous rock-palace called Les Baux in Provence, between Arles and Marseilles. It has been recently visited and described by Captain Conder (*Heth and Moab* pp. 163 *sq.*, and *Syrian Stone-lore* pp. 194 *sq.*) In addition to the rock-fortress in which Hyrcanus kept his stores and stables, he also built a palace sur-

Egyptians lost Syria, and it passed into the hands of the Seleucids.

I have quoted these legends about little-known personages at considerable length, for, however embellished, they show clearly the strong tendency of the upper and the energetic classes to cultivate the Hellenistic courts and their manners. So too we must allow for the influence of the Hellenistic or Greek cities, as they were called, which were settled all round Palestine and Syria. We find Greek names like Aristobulus and Alexander coming into use, along with the Hebrew Joseph, John, and Simon,[1] and in both the Maccabees and in Josephus special stress is laid upon the building of a Greek gymnasium in Jerusalem, and the gathering of the young men at the sound of the discus.[2]

rounded by a great fosse immediately to the south. 'Here we note three peculiarities. First, the enormous size of the stones, sometimes 8 by 20 feet, the face of the stone being surrounded by a sunken draft like the masonry of Herod's temple, which was probably an imitation of Greek art. Secondly, we note the imitation of Greek art in the details: we have honeysuckles, triglyphs, guttae, Doric and semi-Corinthian capitals, and moulded door-jambs, evidently copied from Greece. In the third place, we note features peculiar, and apparently of local origin, such as the extraordinary, almost Egyptian-looking capitals of some of the central columns.' 'Here then the luxurious son of Josephus lived in the enjoyment of freedom and fair scenery. Here from his caverns he looked on at the Arab slaves dragging great blocks to the palace rising on its island in the artificial lake. Here perhaps he stored wine of Helbon in his rocky cellars, and beautiful Nabathaean horses were stabled in the rocks above. Here, finally, he fell by his own hand, and the silence of the wilderness descended on the scene of his cruelty and pride' (Conder *loc. cit.*)

[1] *Antt.* xii. 5, 1 'Jesus changed his name into Jason, and Onias was called Menelaus.' His brother was Lysimachus. Dositheus and Sosipater, leaders under Judas Maccabaeus (2 Macc. xii. 19), may have been mere mercenaries.

[2] 2 Macc. iv. 8-15 'But when Seleucus was dead, and Antiochus, surnamed Epiphanes, came to the throne, Jason, the brother of Onias, made underhand attempts to gain the chief priesthood, having promised

They even took artificial means to efface the marks of their nationality, so as to pass for unorthodox when they stripped in the arena. Abroad, their great intelligence and faithfulness to the master they had chosen were strong reasons for their promotion to places of trust and emolument both at the Syrian and the Egyptian courts, and so much did they affect to rank as members of the great Hellenic race that we read in Josephus of complimentary relations with Sparta,[1] in which they genealogise themselves into cousins of the most aristocratic of all Hellenes.

The curious document in Josephus (*Antt.* xii. 4, 10), thrust in out of its proper connexion, is taken from first Maccabees xii., and purports to be a missive from King Areus of Sparta to a high-priest Onias. This can hardly be genuine. But

the king in an interview 360 talents, and from some other source of revenue 60. In addition to these he promised his bond for 150 more, if he were allowed on his own authority to establish a gymnasium and an ephebic system, and to enrol the people of Jerusalem as Antiochenes. But when the king agreed and he obtained the dominion, he forthwith led his fellow-countrymen over to the Hellenic type, and the friendly relations with the court established by John the father of Eupolemus, who had made the embassy concerning friendship and alliance to the Romans, he discarded, and abolishing the lawful constitution, he brought in lawless innovations. For he very gladly established a gymnasium under the very acropolis, and the best of the youths he organised under the *petasus* (hat of Hermes). And there was such a culmination of Hellenism and growth of denationalisation on account of the extreme impiety of the unholy pseudo-high-priest Jason, that the priests were no longer zealous about the services of the altar, but, despising the temple and neglecting the sacrifices, they were eager to share in the unlawful allowances of the palaestra, attending the summons of the discus; and, holding of no account their ancestral rewards, they valued above all Hellenic distinctions.'

[1] The reader need not examine Hitzig's absurd theory (*ZDMG* for 1855, pp. 731 *sq.*) that the Lycian Patara was here meant by Sparta! The text (Obadiah 20) telling of the remnant that is in *Sepharad*, which might be so pointed as to read Sparta, was probably the starting-point of this claim to kinship with the Lacedaemonians.

it is certainly an early document, and is clear evidence of the desire to establish a heathen relationship. Nor do I think so strange a legend could possibly have arisen without some actual contact or some cause of communication in the very complicated politics of those days.[1] If we examine carefully all the possibilities of the case, we shall find one actual point of contact which may give us a clue to this strange story. It was the constant habit of Spartans, even of the highest rank, to go as mercenaries to Alexandria, where the Jews were a large and important society. It must therefore have been a matter of great convenience to these wandering exiles, often driven from home by revolutions, to find a friendly reception in the Egyptian capital. On the other hand, we may be sure that the Jews, though granted many privileges at Alexandria, were not on an equal footing with the Macedonians and Greeks, at least in Hellenistic opinion, and were therefore most anxious to assert for themselves a mythical ancestry akin to the Hellenes. It

[1] This consanguinity is already assumed as quite recognised in 2nd Macc. v. 9 *καὶ ὁ συγχοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἀποξενώσας ἐπὶ ξένης ἀπώλετο πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀναχθείς, ὡς διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τευξόμενος σκέπης.* 2nd Macc. represents an early source, independent both of 1st Macc. and Josephus. Cf. also the decree of the Pergamenes in Josephus xiv. 10, 22, which concludes: 'Desiring them to remember that our ancestors were friendly to the Jews, even in the days of Abraham, who was the father of all the Hebrews, as we have found it set down in our public records.' The Pergamenes were great manufacturers of pedigrees, seeing that they had no real antiquity of their own. But still this allusion is very strange. The decree is from the days of Ant. Epiphanes. Cf. Stark's *Gaza* p. 582 for some other such identifications, and Steph. Byz. *sub voc.* Ἰουδαία. I have noted above the Pergamene inscription, p. 491, about Tegea and the foundation of Pergamum by Auge. This claim of the Jews to be cousins of the Greeks brought them into serious difficulties at least once, cf. Nicolaus Dam. fr. 92 (quoted by Josephus), when the Asiatic Greeks urged to Agrippa that if Greeks they should also practise the religion of the Greeks, and submit to the same burdens.

was under these circumstances that I fancy the missive of Areus, if genuine, was suggested by the Jews and Spartans in Alexandria, where the false genealogy was probably concocted.

What evidence have we in Hebrew literature of this strong and dangerous current which threatened to denationalise the people and destroy their religion? Very little indeed, for the representatives of this side, so far as they were orthodox, must have belonged to the Sadducees. Now the Sadducees, though they maintained themselves by foreign influence, and were powerful as aristocrats and men of culture even in later days, were old-fashioned or formal conservatives in religion, and were altogether silenced in literature by the greater energy and success of the democratic movement headed by the Scribes and Pharisees. Their early books and statements of their doctrine are all lost, and there is even considerable doubt as to the amount of their scepticism. There remains only one book of a philosophical character, and this rather the confessions of a doubter, standing aloof from all professed parties, than the manifesto of a sect—the book of Ecclesiastes—in which we may read the intellectual condition of the higher classes during the period before us.

I know how impossible it is to touch any book in the Canon of Scripture without falling among controversialists worse than those who once infested the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. Concerning this very book opinions vary from that of the few remaining enthusiasts who attribute it to Solomon, to that of extreme sceptics, who place it in the days of the Herods, and even after the Christian era. The reader must be content to accept from me the result of a careful study of the question, which leads me to place it at

neither extreme, but some time after the return from the captivity, and before the troubles of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees. Thus it comes, I think, into the very time when Greek books and ideas were spreading through Syria and Palestine.

We seem to have, as it were, a series of books at this period, showing the gradual increase of Hellenistic influences. The book of the Son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), the book of the Preacher (Ecclesiastes), and the Wisdom of Solomon indicate three separate stages of this development, whether they be really successive in time, or what is more likely, written by three authors affected by the new fashion in different degrees. But they all most probably belong to this epoch. The earliest in temper and knowledge, for it represents the narrow, self-contented morality of the older Proverbs, without any trace of larger views, is Ecclesiasticus. The author is shrewd and practical, often full of kindness and humanity, and his philosophy is a very sound guide to ordinary people. But there is throughout a certain vulgarity and narrowness, which is far removed from the cosmopolitan spirit of Hellenism. The author is indeed kindlier than the fierce old Hebrews had once been, but hardly ever rises to real generosity. I think we may conclude that the author was strictly a Jew of Palestine, who either did not or would not learn foreign wisdom, nay, who probably, like Cato at Rome, thought it a mere mischief.

The book of Wisdom, on the other hand, is written by a man saturated with Greek philosophy, and who, moreover, has made up his mind that Platonism is the creed most in accordance with the Jewish faith. Hence both his thoughts and his language are coloured everywhere by this theory, and much of his eloquence, which is esteemed the greatest among all the apocryphal books, is due to this training. If

the work be later than Ecclesiastes, still it most probably dates from the second century B.C.

By far the most interesting, however, of the three, and justly rewarded with a place in the Canon, is the intermediate book, Ecclesiastes. The unknown author, who quotes texts from Solomon and writes in his name, gives us no metaphysic, but rather a practical review of human life from its ethical side, and with special reference to the question of the *summum bonum*, or true nature of happiness. This in itself suggests that he had come in contact with the Greek philosophy so familiar in Asia Minor and Hellenistic Syria, which discussed this very problem from opposite points of view. It is even asserted, though without any proper accuracy, that the Pharisees and Sadducees in Judaea were derived from the Stoics and Epicureans respectively. The points of difference are here more numerous and important than the likenesses. But as regards Ecclesiastes the case is in my opinion far plainer. The book seems to gather opinions from both sides, and so attempts a sort of eclectic philosophy, which is only a cento of inconsistent views. After balancing all these theories of life, the writer concludes that practical religion is the only road to happiness —a very reasonable conclusion, though founded in his case not on argument but on mere perplexity.

So vague, however, are his references to all the Hellenistic systems, and so thoroughly Hebrew is the book in other respects, that most professed Hebraists are prepared to deny to it the influence of heathen doctrines, and to expound it as the pure outcome of a Semitic spirit, speculating upon the fortunes of the race, and finding that with the disappearance of idolatry, which is here not even mentioned, scepticism and formalism were the prevailing phases of irreligion. All their positive arguments appear to me sound,

but not so their assumption that they have thereby refuted their adversaries. For these too have, I think, shown beyond reasonable doubt that Hellenistic thinking has been a cause of the curious contrast which the work shows to other Hebrew theology. Their case has been recently strengthened by the ingenious book of Professor Pfleiderer on Heraclitus, wherein he shows that, as regards both occasional thoughts and their form in words, the Preacher seems to have copied, not from the dry tracts of the newer philosophers, but from the mystic, prophetical, semi-poetical utterances of the sage of Ephesus, whose works were now read with interest not only by the Stoics, who owed him sundry theories, but by Oriental thinkers, who found him far more congenial than the dull post-Aristotelian prose. Both sides then may be accepted in this sense, that, as you may often see the child of two completely dissimilar parents showing a strong likeness to each, so that men dispute on the point, and see the father or the mother reproduced in him according to their varying preoccupations, so we have in Ecclesiastes the offspring of a marriage, or at least of a temporary union, between two widely different phases of thought, each showing itself plainly, though, on the whole, the language and nationality of the writer makes his Hellenism the more superficial, his Hebraism the deeper and more determining factor. We may see then in this curious and remarkable document signs not only of the pervading fashion of the day, but also of the deep reaction which was presently to set in, and make Egyptians and Syrians and Parthians into Orientals again, after they had been wellnigh conquered for the civilisation of the West.

We must remember that a national reaction took place in Egypt before it arose in Palestine. The government of Ptolemy Philopator (222-205 B.C.), though represented as that of a man of pleasure, who attended to no serious business,

was nevertheless a very oppressive one for his Egyptian subjects. We hear from Athenaeus of the extravagant ships which he built, and we know from the circumstances at Alexandria when he died[1] that he allowed his mercenaries and mistresses to control all his affairs. The debasing of the coinage in his day, and other financial straits, have been brought out by the recent researches of M. Revillout, and we may be sure that this was the main burden of his oppression.[2] The result was a series of revolutions by the Egyptians, and various demands to obtain in the army and elsewhere a position equal to that of the Greek and Macedonian soldiers.

The third book of the Maccabees gives us in detail a story of Philopator's attempt to violate the Holy of Holies, after his victory at Raphia (217 B.C.), and his consequent furious persecution of the Jews, who only escaped destruction through a series of miracles. The whole air of the book, and the fact that Josephus tells of similar persecutions by Ptolemy Physcon (Euergetes II.) somewhat later, have led critics to reject altogether the account in this book of the Maccabees, which is evidently composed as a counterpart to the story of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, which had been related as an instance of special providence in the second Maccabees. But though I now take a more lenient view of the vices of the king than did the earlier historians, I hesitate to treat it as a mere fiction, and believe that together with the persecution of the Egyptians, probably for the sake of extortion, there was a persecution of the Jews, who were not only a very wealthy community at Alexandria

[1] Above, p. 453.

[2] *Rev. égypt.* ii. 115 *sq.*, and on the debasing of the coinage and the new copper standard, iii. 83 *sq.* All M. Revillout's conclusions on this point are, however, now to be corrected by Mr. Grenfell's Appendix III. to our edition of the *Revenue Papyrus* (Oxford, 1896).

and through Egypt, but possessed in the temple of Jerusalem one of the richest banks and treasuries then known. If Philopator or his ministers did not make attempts upon this treasure, or raise increased tribute from the Jews under the dominion of Egypt, it would seem the most unaccountable oversight on their part. And so it was that Antiochus the Great was able to conquer Coele-Syria and Palestine at the end of Philopator's reign, and also that the Jews, who had hitherto always sided in their sympathies with Egypt against Syria, thought the change of masters a happy one, and submitted without difficulty to the Lord of Antioch.

Josephus has given us[1] several interesting documents, or else free renderings of documents, showing how carefully this Antiochus (the Great) considered the susceptibilities of his new subjects, and we hear with surprise that he persuaded 2000 heads of families of the *diaspora* in Media and Babylonia to transport their families and property into Lydia and Phrygia, there to live as citizens in the cities of Asia Minor, and support the king's interest against the less trustworthy and fickle Greeks. We know that in these new settlements they were no longer called Jews but Ephesians, Laodiceans, etc., and that they were in some senses privileged inhabitants. But let me add how extended must have been the trade relations of the Jews, how well must they have known the conditions of life and

[1] *Antt.* xii. 3, § 3.—Ewald (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel* iii. 2, 329) is disposed to admit the authenticity of the two letters here inserted, in which Antiochus declares his policy of tolerance and generosity to the Jews. To me they seem specimens of the many forgeries made by the Jews in after days, wherewith they supported their claims to privileges and indulgences from later kings and from Rome. Successful forgeries are, however, usually exaggerations of real facts, and not inventions in conflict with them. The policy of Antiochus demanded some such declarations.

of society all through the Hellenistic world, when such an offer was accepted apparently as a favour, and not as an intolerable punishment. This was mainly due, I suppose, to the strong affection of the Jews for their sacred metropolis, and consequent indifference as regards their actual residence, from which they sent yearly embassies with contributions to the temple, in which they deposited the money of widows and orphans for security. No doubt, the scattered and outlying Jews often preserved deeper religious feeling and purer orthodoxy than the magnates of Jerusalem, tempted as these latter were by the almost irresistible attractions of the brilliancy of Alexandrian and Antiochene life. If many of the poor people who sent their contributions from the ends of the earth had known of the gymnasium at Jerusalem, or of the growing dislike to Jewish rites under the shadow of the temple, they would indeed have shuddered with pious horror. But all these things were kept quiet by skilful diplomacy, and the silent Hellenisation of the country, along with the increase in wealth of the temple, lasted through the remaining years of Antiochus the Great, who died when he was just beginning to rob temples for his enormous Roman tribute, and who would certainly have plundered this temple as he attempted at other shrines in his upper provinces. The gentle and weak Seleucus who succeeded did not proceed to any actual violences.[1] But with Antiochus Epiphanes came the day of trouble.

We have the narrative of Josephus, borrowed apparently from the first Maccabees, and a collateral and independent account, that of the second Maccabees, written with a

[1] 2 Macc. iii. 3 speaks of Seleucus Philopator's even contributing, as his father had done, to the sacrifices. This is inconsistent with the account of iv. 7, which represents the beginning of the claims upon the temple treasure as made by his order.

strong moral purpose, to illustrate the providence of God. The so-called third Maccabees, as I explained just now, is not concerned with this crisis at all. But whatever grave doubts there are about the Ptolemy of this latter book, there can be none about the policy of Antiochus (IV.) Epiphanes. He was an extravagant person in many ways, and with many good qualities was upon occasions a violent despot. Even the first Maccabees confesses his strong emotion at the murder of the ex-high-priest Onias, seduced from the asylum at Daphne.[1] This good man had adventured himself to Antioch to plead for his nation, and expose the frauds and oppressions of his renegade brother Menelaus, who had him murdered there by one Andronicus. The king had the murderer publicly led in disgrace through Antioch, and executed on the spot where the crime had been committed. Yet when he himself was thwarted, he was guilty of both cruelty and injustice. He was, as we know, a violent Hellenist, perhaps the more so because he had found it so much in fashion at Rome, and because he was determined to establish Greek habits all through his kingdom. In this he was supported, as far as Judaea was concerned, by the anti-national party, who probably called themselves the party of progress. They bought for themselves the title of high-priest, an office long since given away by either Persian or Egyptian monarch to the greatest favourite or the highest bidder. They undertook to establish gymnasia and ephebic training in the place of the Law of Moses, and they had every prospect of success.

But when Antiochus was stopped in his last attack on Egypt by the Romans, and was baulked of Alexandria, his greatest prize, which was on the point of falling into his hands,

[1] iv. 37.

he set out homeward very short of money, and still more of temper, and determined to recoup himself from the immense treasures gathered at the temple of Jerusalem. He ordered Greek sacrifices there, profaned the Holy of Holies, and crushed all opposition with massacre. We are told [1] that he carried off 1800 talents to Antioch, not counting perhaps all the splendid gold ornaments, such as the table and cups given by Ptolemy Philadelphus. Moreover he commenced a systematic persecution of the Jewish religion all through the country, insisting upon Greek altars, Greek sacrifices, and punishing with reckless severity the practice of circumcision and the reading of the Law. Though apparently successful at Jerusalem, he failed signally in the more pious and conservative country parts, where the inhabitants evaded or braved his commands, until the father of Judas Maccabaeus, the brave Mattathias, a priest resident in the mountain village of Modeïn, slew the king's envoys and raised the standard of revolt.

It is not my business to go further into the history of the Maccabees. The point of importance to the history of Hellenism is already plain. By violence and cruelty Antiochus Epiphanes stopped the quiet leavening of the Jews, which promised to subdue even their stubborn nationality, and forced all the enthusiastic spirits into a strong and successful opposition. Semitism or Judaism reasserted itself victoriously against Hellenism, and though the rulers of Judaea down to Herod, nay, even the later Maccabees, were always tending to join the aristocratic or Sadducee party, and thus to show a leaning towards Greek court manners; though the later literature, such as the book of Wisdom, shows strong and manifest traces of Platonic studies; though the language of the country people became

[1] 2 Macc. v. 21.

so invaded by Greek, that everywhere and in all classes men understood it, and all our gospels, as well as the second and third Maccabees, the book of Wisdom, etc., were composed in that tongue—for all this the reaction in spirit was complete, and, humanly speaking, we may thank Antiochus IV. for having saved for us that peculiar Semitic type which has influenced so strongly the literature and the politics of the Western world.

The earlier Maccabees were indeed little more than local leaders, rebel chiefs who lived partly as outlaws, partly as raiders; there was always a large section of the people ready to obey the Syrian monarch, and even to profit by the defeat of the patriots. But after Antiochus IV. there arose no strong monarch, either in Egypt or Syria, who could wholly subdue them. Nay rather both thrones were incessantly subject to the rivalry of various claimants, who were glad to buy the support of any rebellious province by large promises of liberty and amnesty. Thus the decay of these Hellenistic kingdoms enabled the Jews, and indeed the Egyptians, to maintain their national customs till the Romans came and embodied all in their universal sway. The literature with which this movement was supported was not only the composition of prophecies and visions, in imitation of the old prophets, with special application to current events, but a rehandling of national history with the view of bringing out strongly moral lessons in favour of the Jewish faith, and of supplying examples of patriotism. It is likely that some of these books were composed in Greek, and all of them were translated into that language for the benefit of the western and Egyptian *Dispersion*, which had forgotten the vernacular use of Hebrew or Aramaic. Unfortunately, as is always the case with historians writing for a moral purpose, these nationalists not only saw their

facts in a false light, but even went so far as to invent rewards and punishments in accordance with their theory, so that we arrive by degrees at historical romances which have little more historical basis than the names of the actors.

We still possess a regular series of this kind from sober history to audacious fiction. The first book of Maccabees is a valuable account of the history of the Jews under the Diadochi down to the reign of Antiochus Sidetes. There is no evidence of any distorting of facts here. But the author of the second Maccabees was evidently not content with this tame account, but rehandles part of the same history[1] with stronger moral and patriotic accentuation, though still on a historical basis, with a few miraculous ornaments, and with documents of a very suspicious character introduced as evidence. The third Maccabees is a patriotic effusion concerning an alleged persecution of the Jews by Ptolemy Philopator, which may be a pure invention, as many of the details most certainly are. But the historical frame is still a real one. Even this cannot be said of a novel like the book of Judith, which jumbles names and events in a ludicrous manner, making Holophernes, whom we can identify as the Cappadocian Orophernes,[2] an Assyrian general under Nebuchadnezzar! Yet even here the moral purpose is clear. Through the example of a fair Jewish widow, Judith, the duty of the oppressed people to take vengeance on their foreign oppressors is inculcated. A most remarkable parallel to this adaptation of history into a political sermon has been unearthed by M. Revillout from

[1] This discontent with the vulgar impartiality of real facts may also be seen in 1 Esdras as compared with the canonical Ezra, and in the book of Esther compared with its apocryphal additions.

[2] Supposed brother of Ariarathes V., cf. above, p. 496, note.

demotic papyri. There too, under the guise of past history, the duty of rebellion against the Greek foreigners and their rule was enforced by the examples of ancient patriots.[1]

But these very interesting developments of Semitic literature in Greek dress mostly belong to a period subsequent to Antiochus Epiphanes, when the nation, though still struggling and at times conquered, had already asserted its indestructibility. Of the earlier efforts of Hellenistic Jews to make their history and religion known, or to prove its original relation to Greek wisdom and culture, we have only faint traces in the fragments quoted by Eusebius from Alexander Polyhistor. The learned and acute researches of Freudenthal[2] have shown that as the Egyptians had their Manetho, the Chaldaeans their Berosus, the Romans their Fabius Pictor, all of whom put into Greek dress the antiquities of their respective nations, and brought them before the Hellenistic world, so the Jews had at least one serious annalist, Demetrius the Chronographer, who probably at Alexandria, and in the third century B.C., gathered and published the antiquities of the Jewish nation. His fragments seem free from the often barefaced attempts to magnify the Jewish race at the expense of truth and soberness which appear in other fragments, as well as in such productions as the third book of Maccabees or the *Letter of Aristeas*. Another important point which Freudenthal makes is this, that those who chose Greek in preference to Aramaic for the vehicle of their teaching were not all sceptical or denationalised, but that there existed, even in Palestine, a party of orthodox Hellenists, who had adopted Greek language and wisdom without laying aside their

[1] *Rev. Egypt.* ii. 1, 2 *sq.*

[2] *Hellenistische Studien* Breslau, 1875.

patriotism.[1] So deeply had the spirit of the age affected even the most stubborn of Semitic races!

Let us dwell upon this development of Hellenistic anti-Hellenism for a few moments. As there was a school of patriots who rehandled, embellished, or invented national history for the moral benefit of their own people, so there was a school of Jewish writers determined to defend the dignity and antiquity of their nation against the ribald attacks now constantly cropping up among the rival claimants for priority of culture. Both Babylonians and Egyptians claimed to be the first originators of philosophy and religion, and such men as Manetho could not pass by the rival claim of the Hebrews and their Moses. Hence he repeated what he calls current stories about the expulsion of the Jews from Egypt on account of a loathsome disease. But the whole age was now full of literary dishonesty. Not to speak of historical novels and collections of scandalous anecdotes, the rhetorical objects of writing history were openly preferred to its proper uses, and the desire of pleasing a court with its passing policy was stronger than the ambition to command the permanent respect of the world. Hence, as the Jews were the very first to appreciate the material benefits of the new Hellenism, and occupied much of the trade of the new cities, they excited strong and growing jealousy among their townsmen of oriental birth, and so there were not wanting literary attacks based upon the most scurrilous anecdotes and inventions. It was to meet this attack, dishonest and lying as it generally was, that the Jews took up the same weapons, and in a series of fabricated histories or letters from kings endeavoured to refute their accusers, and turn their weapons against them. Such are the letters of the so-called Aristeas, from which the legend of the

[1] *op. cit.* p. 127.

LXX. was derived. Such was the mythical account of Moses and his Egyptian life circulated under the name of Artapanos, and used by various later historians. The accounts of Josephus, where they differ from our Bible in the early part of his history, and some of the documents which he quotes, are attributable to these sources.

This attempt at meeting fraud with fraud was quite a distinct argument from that of the allegorisers—Aristobulus, and afterwards Philo, who desired to explain away difficulties in the early Scriptures rather than to exaggerate them. But no doubt both had their success. It is customary to censure this literary dishonesty in the Hellenistic Jews, as if it had been confined to them, whereas in truth it was perhaps more excusable to adopt it in defence of a serious patriotic cause than for mere rhetorical or literary purposes.

As regards style, Freudenthal, who has written admirably on this subject, remarks that the Hellenistic Jews were one of those societies *without a mother tongue* which have never attained to any true excellence in literature. Even in Palestine their country was so interlarded with Greek, Arabian, and other settlements, that no unity of language was possible, and beyond its limits they had certainly abandoned the use of Aramaic, while the Greek they learned was the new and artificial idiom of the trading classes over the world. Such a speech had neither traditions nor literature to give it dignity, nor those precious associations which give depth and poetry to words—the slow growth of centuries in a homogeneous soil.

These qualities were wanting in all newer Hellenism, and this was, indeed, the irreparable poverty of that age amid all its material splendour. But here is perhaps the best place to insist upon it, because we find this decadence

of style even in a people of the strongest nationality, with a splendid literature of their own, and in their later days producing some books worthy of the great days of classical Hebrew. The Aramaic parts of Daniel, and the book of Ecclesiastes, are literature of a very high order; among the Greek books and fragments left us from this period there is nothing that does not set the teeth of a good Grecian on edge with its violation of classical form.

I pause with regret at the threshold of a deeply interesting intellectual history, which I hope to pursue on another occasion. Let us now turn more particularly to Egypt.[1]

[1] Since the first appearance of this book I have made further researches into this department of the subject, and have set down the evidence in fuller detail in my *Empire of the Ptolemies*. I have therefore refrained from adding notes or illustrations to the following chapter, but refer the reader to that volume. Not a few statements, however, have been modified or silently corrected in the following text.

CHAPTER XXI

DECAYING HELLENISM IN EGYPT

It will be well here to resume the scattered notices of the state of Egypt which have been made in the later chapters of this book, in order that the reader may have before him a clear view of the sequence of events. Ptolemy IV. (Philopator) reigned from 222 to 205 B.C., a life of pleasure and vice, drained his finances, alienated his subjects, and left his infant son in presence of a dangerous national revolt, an empty treasury, faithless mercenaries, and ruthless neighbours. The kingdom would probably have been then absorbed by Syria but for the interference of the Romans, who seem to have appointed a *tutor regis* at Rome in the person of M. Lepidus,[1] and gave Antiochus the Great a still more effective lesson by the battle of Magnesia. Thus Ptolemy V. (Epiphanes), a man of no better character though of far more energy than his father, was enabled to attain his majority without disaster, and hold the reins of government till 180 B.C., when he seems to have been poisoned by some of his household, who heard him inverting Alexander's jest about his friends' money being practically his

[1] Cf. my *Empire of the Ptolemies* p. 296. He may have occupied the place of a *patronus* to the king, which was an offensive term connoting a *client*, and so exchanged for a new official term.

own. We must also take note that the great traditions of the dynasty affected even its worst members, and that there were redeeming points in both Philopator and Epiphanes. Of the former Aelian relates that he established a sort of shrine in honour of Homer, where that personage probably received the rights accorded by Greeks to heroes. He also wrote a play. This at least shows some taste for letters, and respect for the great father of poetry. He also received in the Museum and at his court the Stoic philosopher Sphaerus, the pupil of Cleanthes, with whom he apparently lived in familiar intercourse, as appears from the table-talk preserved by Diogenes Laertius (vii. 6). Though philosophers of all schools were very indulgent to the vices of kings, we can hardly imagine a serious and respectable Stoic frequenting the court of a mere debauchee.[1] But with the Lagidae domestic murders seem part of a family policy not inconsistent with social and literary tastes. Indeed Philometor seems the solitary exception to the rule.

As regards Ptolemy Epiphanes, Polybius specially turns aside (xxii. 3) to tell us that upon the occasion of an alliance between the Achaean League and that king, his ambassador was entertained by Philopoemen, and when mention was made of the king at dinner, the ambassador monopolised the conversation with many praises of the king, and cited many instances of his hardiness and pluck in hunting, and then of his skill in the management of horses and weapons, and his good training in these accomplishments; he had once, when hunting, killed a bull with

[1] It is noticed by Luzac (quoted in Munk *Griech. Lit.-Gesch.* ii. 506) that a considerable number of Peripatetics in this age spent their time in composing anecdotic *Lives*, in which they detailed all sorts of fables about famous men, especially of a disgusting and immoral kind. Many of these may have been intended as justifications of the excesses of the Lagidae.

a javelin from his horse. When the reader remembers that he had certainly no stirrups, and probably no saddle, this feat is remarkable enough. Polybius adds elsewhere that his minister, Polycrates, prevented him from displaying these qualities in warfare, though he was twenty-five years old, when he dragged the captive insurgents in triumph after his chariot. This king was obliged through his ministers to put down a dangerous national revolt, which lasted through many years of his reign, not to speak of various attempts on the part of his condottieri generals to assume irresponsible powers. But on the whole he seems to have been much more fortunate than his father in securing at least some honest and able ministers, like Aristomenes[1]; and though he put down the national revolt with cruelty and treachery, violating the pardon which was apparently promised to the insurgent chiefs, he on the other hand made considerable concessions to Egyptian feeling in his treatment of the national religion.

I suppose much of this better policy was due to his queen, the princess Cleopatra of Syria, daughter of Antiochus III. (the Great), and sister of Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes), whose nominal dower of Phoenicia and Palestine was afterwards the cause of renewed wars, but whose personal character and conduct were far superior to those of her family and court. She seems to have had but one child for a few years after her marriage (191 B.C.), so that when Ptolemy Epiphanes died, or was poisoned, in 180 B.C., her second son was not seven years old.[2] She assumed the reins of power as regent till the majority of the prince,

[1] Plutarch (*de adul.* 32) says it was owing to Aristomenes 'taking the liberty of shaking up the king, when he was falling asleep at a public audience,' that this faithful minister was put to death.

[2] The elder son (Ptolemy VI.) seems to have died very soon after his accession.

fixed in Egypt at fourteen, and seems to have governed with prudence and maintained peace with her neighbours. The *Anacleteria* or public coronation of the king of Egypt was still an event of world-wide importance, and we hear of embassies from all quarters to congratulate him. But the political centre of gravity had completely changed during the previous reign, and this great ceremony was now but an echo of former days, when Egypt controlled all the policy of Hellenism. How much greater and more serious must have been the meeting of all the foreign embassies at Rome in 189 B.C. to congratulate the western republic on the victory of Magnesia! From thenceforth it was to Rome that every eye turned, and to Rome that they trusted for the settlement of their disputes.

When the prudent queen-mother died, shortly after the majority of her son, the war with Antiochus Epiphanes for the possession of Palestine soon supervened. This was the war which brought all the misfortunes upon the Jews. The young king was at once defeated and taken prisoner, and it was now perhaps occurred that curious passage in his life when his eunuch-tutor Eulaeus advised him to take a large sum of money and settle at Samothrace.[1] It was the energy of the younger prince, afterwards joint king with his brother, then king of Cyrene, and in the end his brother's successor (as Euergetes II.), which upheld the national cause in Alexandria, and so far delayed Antiochus's conquest that the two princes, by turns opponents and allies, were able to hold out till the battle of Pydna had left the Romans free to interfere with emphasis, and save Egypt for a time.

But from this period onward, when Antiochus IV. died on his return to Antioch (167 B.C.), the thrones of Antioch

[1] Polyb. xxviii. 21.

and Alexandria were constantly disputed by rival claimants, partly owing to accident, partly to the infamous diplomacy of the Romans, who took care to keep intestine quarrels alive, in order to weaken their eastern allied kingdoms. This is particularly clear in the case of the two Ptolemies, Philometor and Physcon (Euergetes II.), who were perpetually sending rival embassies to Rome, and yet either failed to obtain, or were able to thwart, any decision of the senate. On the whole, however, Philometor was successful; he actually subdued, and might have put to death, his brother in Cyprus, but showed his mother's justice, or perhaps rather gentleness, and prudent policy towards the Romans, in sparing him and giving him back his royalty. We may be quite certain that Physcon, like all other Ptolemies of this period, would not have spared his generous brother for a day. The princesses too of this and the next generation are not more confused in name—they are now almost all Cleopatras,[1] even when sisters of the same house—than they are indistinct in character.

Philometor is called the last good Ptolemy. The Jews afterwards boasted that he had stood in particularly close relation to their nation. He had had teachers and public servants from among them, and knew of their religion and their literature. This at all events is historical, that Onias, son of a high-priest of the same name, who was a refugee in Egypt, finding no doubt that by the transfer of Judaea to the kingdom of Syria the Egyptian Jews had been much cut off from their intercourse with Jerusalem, finding also that they attempted various irregular cults throughout Egypt, perhaps most of all wishing to make them a separate and

[1] The famous name Cleopatra only came into the royal family of Egypt with the Syrian princess just mentioned. Previous queens had been called either Arsinoe or Berenike.

independent religious community, applied to Philometor and his queen to allow him to occupy a ruined temple at Bubastis, and an enclosure overgrown with shrubs and full of sacred animals. He proposed to build here, on the exact model of the Jewish temple, a sacred edifice, to be dedicated to Jehovah, and served by Jewish priests and Levites, adding that the king and queen and their children should also be honoured there, doubtless as *θεοὶ σύνναοι*, or companion gods, according to a usual fashion in Egypt. Josephus, who tells us the story (xiii. 3), puts an answer into Philometor's mouth, conceding the site, but wondering how such a new foundation could be in harmony with the Jewish religion. The argument in reply was founded on a prophecy of Isaiah, foretelling that there should be an altar to the Lord built in Egypt (Is. xix. 19). This was the foundation of the temple of Leontopolis, near Heliopolis, which lasted till the year 70 A.D., but which never attained any real importance for the Jewish nation.

But the fact is here interesting, as showing how far the Jews were ready to accommodate themselves to Egyptian Hellenism; for this very king was in the habit of re-dedicating temples to Greek deities, or rather to Egyptian deities rebaptized (if I may venture the expression) under Greek names. Of this several inscriptions give us information. Josephus adds a story of the formal controversy held before Philometor and his peers between the Samaritan and Judaean Jews as to the respective claims of the temples on Mount Gerizim and Mount Sion to orthodoxy and respect. When the historian adds that the defeated advocates were to suffer death, and that they were executed by Philometor, he evidently tells a falsehood, and throws discredit upon the whole story. But if anything would rehabilitate its credibility, it is his summary of the arguments used by the

victorious Jerusalemites—first proving the long succession from father to son of high-priests, and secondly how all the kings of Asia had honoured the temple with splendid offerings. Such arguments were excellent before Philometor and his friends, but they go very little way to prove the question proposed by the historian for the argument, viz. to show which temple had been built according to the laws of Moses. The whole chapter in Josephus, however embellished it may be, gives us a true picture of the king, agreeing with the stray notices of Polybius, Diodorus, and Athenaeus, so that for our purpose we may set it down as valuable tradition. We must not forget to add that Polybius, our highest authority, qualifies his very favourable account of this king's justice and mercy to his wicked brother and all his subjects by adding that when in prosperity a certain Egyptian dissoluteness and idleness came upon him, which brought him into many difficulties.[1]

It was nevertheless a real loss to Egypt that Philometor was killed (146 B.C.) in an attempt to take the kingdom of Syria from one claimant and give it to another. He won his battle, but was thrown from his horse and dangerously wounded, so that he was carried into his camp insensible. They attempted trepanning his skull, but he only revived sufficiently to have the great satisfaction, as Josephus puts it, of seeing the head of his enemy. His wicked brother immediately laid siege to Alexandria, and the widowed queen of Philometor had no alternative but to submit to marrying him, and to seeing her infant son, the legitimate heir (Ptolemy VIII., Philopator Neos), murdered on the day of her second marriage.

This (technically the ninth) Ptolemy, who reigned for many years (145-117), and who was the last undisturbed

[1] xxxix. 18.

king of Egypt, though he had himself contested his brother's crown for twenty years, was a remarkable person, both in appearance and character, and we may fitly close our history of Hellenism in Egypt with some account of the country as Roman visitors saw it in that day. Indeed, Scipio Aemilianus, on one of his state visits to the subject or allied states, brought with him the Stoic Panaetius, who wrote an account of this more than royal progress. It is a great pity we have only a couple of extracts in Athenaeus of his description of the court of Physcon. For the struggles and broken successions of the thrones of Syria and Egypt, the claims of Demetrius, of Alexander Bala, of Tryphon, of Antiochus Sidetes, and those of Physcon's various children, legitimate and illegitimate, may be studied in Clinton's chronology, but give us no further insight into the spirit of the age. What we must rather endeavour to reach through the veil of anecdote and fable and misconstrued facts is the literary and social condition of Alexandria in the days of the later Ptolemies.

The death of Ptolemy VII., Philometor, brings us to the limit in date set for this book, but it may be well to include in our general view the court of his successor, Physcon (or Euergetes II.), certainly one of the most remarkable sovrans in the series of Ptolemies. He led a stormy and uncertain life from early youth, first in conflict with Antiochus IV., then colleague and presently rival to his brother, long ruler of discontented Cyrene, a frequent suppliant at Rome, cajoled and baulked in turn by Roman diplomacy, conquered and forgiven—probably the sorest thing of all—by his generous brother. So he at last forced his way to the throne with the murder of the proper heir, embittered against his old subjects at Cyrene, embittered still more against Alexandria, and determined to have his revenge.

He let loose the mercenaries upon the populace, and a few years afterwards, having enraged the people into revolt by his horrible treatment of his wife Cleopatra, whose younger son Memphites, his own heir, he had murdered and then sent to his mother as a birthday present, he repeated his massacres at Alexandria in repressing this second rebellion. Nevertheless he was all smiles and courtesy when the embassy, headed by Scipio Aemilianus and accompanied by Panaetius, came from Rome to inquire into his conduct. Owing to his luxurious life he had grown enormously fat, and wore a long loose garment reaching to the feet, with long sleeves down to his wrists; his politeness to Scipio, to whom he showed all his wealth and appointments, compelled him to accompany the Roman on foot, which was quite contrary to his habit, as he usually required the support of two people to move. It was probably, I think, the influence of this Roman embassy which made him spare Marsyas, the general of Cleopatra's rebellion, and even reconcile himself with this queen, whose feelings we can hardly understand, seeing that no cruelty or insult towards her had been omitted by Physcon. When the divine right of kings is so thoroughly acknowledged as it then was in Egypt all the laws of human morality cease to be applied to them.

But though his reconciliation with his wretched divorced queen seems to have been effected, it was not so with the Greek population of Alexandria, who had been the principal agents in the opposition. All our scanty notices agree that his massacres and confiscations not only cleared this great city of its preponderance of Greeks, but drove into exile most of the learned men of the Museum, and when the king, threatened, as I suppose, by Scipio, issued edicts of amnesty, and invitations for these people to return, they refused to do so. We are told, in fact, that the persecution

of Physcon filled Greece, Asia Minor, and the Isles with crowds of learned men, who brought there the wisdom and learning of Alexandria. These accounts remind us of the effects produced by Herod's persecution of the early Christian Church, or by the Turkish conquest of Constantinople. Persecution produced a wide diffusion of higher knowledge.

More curious and more interesting is the statement that the Greek population and the savants refused to return, which implies that from henceforth the Hellenistic character of this great city was seriously impaired. As to the fact, we have it vouched for by the indisputable authority of Polybius, who visited Alexandria after the double catastrophe. Polybius, says our meagre excerpt,[1] having been in the city, speaks with horror of its then condition, and says that three races or kinds of people inhabit the city—the Egyptian or native race, clever and orderly; secondly, the mercenary class, large, unruly and troublesome, for from long habit the court supported an army, which had learned rather to rule than to obey through the worthlessness of the kings. The third was the race of the Alexandrians, not very orderly either, owing to the same causes, but still better than the former, for though of mixed blood yet they were of old Greek origin, and inherited the common traditions of the Greeks. But as this population had disappeared, principally through Euergetes Physcon's fault (during whose reign Polybius visited Alexandria)—for Physcon being revolted against repeatedly let his soldiers loose upon the populace and massacred it—such being the composition of the inhabitants, the poet's word indeed remained true: 'to visit Egypt is a long journey and distressing.'

It does not appear that either Polybius or his friend

[1] xxxiv. 14.

Scipio thought of penetrating to the ancient splendours of the country; Scipio went only as far as Memphis (close to the present Cairo) and studied chiefly the richness of the soil, the dense population, and the remarkable defensibility of the country.[1] Polybius, with all his general culture, probably never went beyond Canopus, and neither of them thought of visiting the splendours of the now forgotten and half-deserted Thebes.

But why did the long-settled Greeks of Alexandria not return to their city? The victims of earthquakes and volcanoes are no sooner exhumed and the houses cleared than the fugitive population returns and settles again upon the threatened site. Why did the fury of the king produce a greater and more lasting effect? Only because it coincided with permanent and growing causes, just as a sudden plague permanently depopulates a decaying country, whereas a strong nation recovers the shock and fills up its ranks. The centre of gravity of Hellenism was changing rapidly from the East to Rome. Many enterprising Alexandrians must have been thinking of moving thither when they were decided by the disturbances. Moreover the Hellenistic states now under the control of Rome were secure from violence and bloodshed. The Romans had not yet displayed their ruthless commercial rapacity, and were still great peace-makers throughout the world.[2] These causes may have determined the mercantile classes. The literary men, on the other hand, who had gradually made their university no mere home for learning and research but a training place for young men, must have felt that the Alexandria of those days was the worst possible place for such a purpose. Who would venture to send his son into the luxurious and dissolute capital, when

[1] Diod. Sic. pp. 629, 630.

[2] Cf. the passage quoted from 1 Macc., above, p. 474.

Tarsus, Rhodes, Athens offered the safe retreat of a quiet university town, whose main object was now the education of well-bred youths?

Thus the furies of Physcon undid what he strove to accomplish in keeping Alexandria a great literary and scientific centre. The king himself was an author, and wrote memoirs from which a few interesting things are quoted by Athenaeus. He had been the pupil of no less a man than the famous Aristarchus, the prince of ancient critics, in whose day that recension of ancient texts was accomplished which has preserved them to our days in comparative purity.[1]

The name of Aristarchus reminds me that the reader will here expect some account of the literary and scientific condition of Alexandria under the later Ptolemies up to the period of the dispersion just mentioned, which is placed about the year 135 B.C.

The complexion of Alexandrian studies had indeed considerably changed. Alexandrian poetry, if we except short and slight pieces such as epigrams, was going out of fashion. Men had collected the texts of the great masters, and found it far more interesting and profitable to criticise and explain them than to attempt to rival them. Moreover the Greek tongue was rapidly degenerating by constant Oriental and Egyptian use, so that the Museum found itself obliged, far more urgently than the French Academy, to determine and, if possible, to maintain a classical language as opposed

[1] I think I may say this when we compare the good mediaeval MSS., derived from the traditions and copies of the Museum, with the disgracefully bad fragments of early date—almost from Ptolemaic times—found on papyri in Egypt. Such Egyptian texts as the Bankes fragment of the *Iliad*, or the passages from Euripides lately found, show what Greek books were becoming in the hands of local scribes.

to local and corrupt idioms. The day had arrived when grammatical criticism was really a science of the last importance, and when its greatest master justly earned a splendid reputation.

It is strange to think how all these great labours might never have been suspected, though they affect all our classical texts, but for the survival of one MS. of Homer with the Greek notes or scholia which were selected in after days from the commentaries of the Alexandrians. Even in this book we have only the *Iliad*, and in almost every disputed reading only the final decision of Aristarchus, his predecessors being seldom quoted except for refutation. But we know that the critical school began with Zenodotus, continued with Aristophanes of Byzantium, both acute men who did a great deal for the history of the older Greek poetry, and reached its summit with Aristarchus, the tutor of Ptolemy Philometor, as well as of Physcon, and flourishing in Philometor and Physcon's reigns. Two opponents of his, the Separatist school at Alexandria, who urged the contrasts between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and the Pergamene school, who perceived the many exceptions to strict analogy (anomalies) in human speech, helped to bring out his talents for controversy, but also the weaker sides of his character. It is to his strongly conservative instincts that we owe more than can be acknowledged in the preservation of Homer. He was exceedingly cautious and careful, sparing of hypotheses, and deciding by parallel cases and from a comparison of the uses of words all through the poems. But we may suspect that after he had become a literary dictator, and found that his word was law, he tampered with the evidence before him to establish favourite theories, such as the Attic origin of Homer, and the single authorship of the two great epics. This is not the place to go farther

into Aristarchus's labours.[1] Unrivalled as were the resources of the Museum and Library for these studies, both the greatest masters felt Alexandria so uncongenial that Aristophanes strove to escape in old age to Syria, and Aristarchus ended his life in Cyprus. The particular circumstances are not preserved to us in either case.

Turning to the Alexandrian exact science of this epoch, we do not indeed find names so brilliant as those of earlier Alexandria, which have still left us Euclid on geometry, Apollonius on conic sections, Archimedes on statics, and Eratosthenes on scientific geography.[2] But from the later days we can cite Hero and Philo, who treated of dynamics, chiefly in reference to projectiles and the engines used in war. From the same generation comes the great astronomer Hipparchus, the one man who combined careful observation with speculation, and to whom we owe the first closer determination of the length of the solar year (he made it 365 5′ 55·12″) and the first attempt at a catalogue of stars. With these discoveries he proposed to reform the geography of Eratosthenes as regards latitudes and longitudes, and correct the *Phaenomena* of Aratus.[3] These leading names, to which many more might be added, show that the scientific position of Alexandria was still splendid. We may assert the like of its medical school, which is said to have enriched all Hellenism and Rome by an influx of its physicians when the dispersion under Physcon took place.

[1] The curious student may consult the special works of Lehrs and A. Ludwig, and indeed a host of others, and may see a *résumé* of what they have said in the opening chapters of my *Hist. of Greek Class. Literature*.

[2] Even learned classical writers are seldom aware of the quantity of Greek mathematical tracts extant, and which I only characterise here quite generally, referring to Mr. Gow's *Hist. of Alexandrian Mathematics* and to Susemihl's chapters on the subject.

[3] Cf. above, p. 246.

I have already spoken above (p. 249) of the merits of Eratosthenes in mathematics and astronomy. His discoveries as a geographer were, however, even more important, and we still have a most interesting criticism of his estimate of Homer and his mythical geography in the introduction to Strabo's comprehensive work (*Prolegomena* chap. ii). In an elaborate argument the historical inquirer endeavours to refute the principle of Eratosthenes, that Homer and the old poets only wrote for the pleasure of their hearers, to fascinate them (ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκα), and not for their instruction. Strabo tries hard to prove that this is quite wrong; that Homer intended to instruct, and has therefore been the basis of all Greek instruction for centuries. He quotes instances of Homer's accuracy of description, of his careful choice of epithets, of his truly historical and geographical instinct. The argument reads just like that of an old-fashioned theologian nowadays, defending the book of Genesis against sceptical attacks. But though we have not Eratosthenes's argument, and may be sure that Strabo did not give it in its original strength, we cannot mistake the advanced and modern attitude of the Alexandrian geographer, amateur though he may have been in what Strabo calls philosophy. He represents the positive side, as opposed to the theological and the metaphysical, and shows how sound and tame was the scientific spirit which had grown up in the Museum.

But if the scientific side of the Museum, including classical criticism, was very sound, much cannot be said for its literature. New poetry was checked, as I have said, by the proper appreciation of the great masters and the dread of the critics' ridicule; but in prose, though the production was enormous in quantity, the quality was very poor. In addition to the prime and inexplicable fact—the decay of

literary genius—we may assign as a cause of this decadence the enormous materials brought together in Alexandria, which gave so vast a field for exposition and commentary that men felt there was no time for polishing their style. We must remember that through its very founder the Peripatetic school had coloured all the pursuits of the Museum—the Peripatetic school with its encyclopaedic tastes, its contempt of literary form, its passion for details. These lesser points in the great Aristotle were imitated by his followers, and so the whole literary prose of Alexandria becomes a wilderness of collections—generally of small details, without any appreciation of their relative importance. No doubt a great deal of gold was to be found scattered through the chaff, as we may see from Plutarch, Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius, and others, who, from these biographical and historical dictionaries, culled geographical and zoological facts, curious natural phenomena, fabulous accounts of distant lands, of signal virtues and more signal vices, catalogues of ancient myths and usages, general histories of the world in chronicle. But in all this forest of detail there was no large theory, no fruitful principle.

Such was the condition of Alexandrian philosophy and history. Rhetoric had never flourished there, partly from having no practical field under a despotic government, partly from the contempt in which it was held by later Greek philosophers. The only living and fruitful system of philosophy—Stoicism—never made itself a home at Alexandria, though individual Stoics were invited there and flattered with every courtesy.

Thus, to sum up this whole review of Alexandria, the positive aspects of knowledge had completely ousted the metaphysical, as Comte would say, in its poetry, its philosophy, its faith. No doubt the Alexandrian dons thought

this a great advance upon their forefathers. To understand poetry accurately, to analyse the laws of its production, to gather facts and be content to wait for their explanation, to chronicle events and refrain from connecting them by theory—all this seemed wiser and more advanced than the dreams of Plato and the enthusiasm of Pindar. But erudition, however respectable, is not genius, and moreover it is repulsive to the world at large, while genius possesses an eternal charm. Nor will any intelligent age permit itself to be defrauded of its high privilege to speculate upon the origin of things and the destinies of the world.

Thus it happened that a combination of causes, of which the decay of speculative philosophy and the dispersion of the Greek population are the most certain, made room for the ambitious efforts of the Jews to have their religion and philosophy accepted by the Hellenistic world. No doubt Aristophanes and Aristarchus looked upon their earlier productions with horror. Greek grammar, as conceived by the critical school, was defined as the practical knowledge of the use of the classical authors, and this use was violated in almost every sentence of the LXX.

But when the learned of the Museum were obliged to flee from the massacres of Ptolemy Physcon, there remained room for the lesser learning of the Jews, which hitherto had occupied an obscure and not very respectable position. What they suffered in the troubles of the times seems to me very difficult to ascertain. It is stated quite definitely by Josephus (*against Apion* ii. 5) that they only escaped by a miracle from massacre by Physcon, seeing that they had taken the side of Queen Cleopatra against him in the revolt. Why, then, does he make no mention of this prominent event in his *Antiquities*, especially when he speaks

with strong reprobation of the foundation of the Egyptian temple by Onias, the very person whose opposition to Physcon brought about the great persecution? Josephus is so fond of providential retributions that it seems strange for him to pass over so suitable a case for his favourite moral reflections. But the facts of the threatened massacre, the preparing of the elephants by intoxication, and the miraculous interference, with many other fabulous additions, are attributed by the third book of Maccabees to the reign of Philopator some seventy years earlier.

How is it, too, that if the Jews were so prominent in the insurrection against Physcon, no notice of them is taken by Polybius in describing the Alexandrians?[1] Does he ignore them altogether, or class them among the Greeks, or among the natives? That he had studied their peculiarities, and therefore did not write in ignorance, appears from another passage (xvi. 39). The true solution seems to be that he classed them among the natives. For whatever Josephus may say, when he strives to make out (*against Apion* 2, § 4) that they were Alexandrians in the sense that Macedonian and Greek settlers were, it is certain that if this were so, Polybius here and in his account of the riot on the accession of Epiphanes[2] would have mentioned them. Their privileges, therefore, must have been mainly exemptions on the ground of their religion, which indeed is the only point mentioned in the stories of the favour of Alexander the Great.[3] This conclusion I find supported on other grounds by T. Mommsen in his last volume,[4] where he shows that it was easy to

[1] Above, p. 541. [2] Above, pp. 456 *sq.* [3] Cf. above, p. 504.

[4] *Röm. Gesch.* v. 491, note, where he quotes a decisive passage from Josephus (xiv. 7, § 3), though in iii. 442 he had said that Caesar gave them the same rights as the Greeks at Alexandria. There is an inscription (*CIG* No. 5361) still more decisive.

confuse the various privileged classes with one another, on account of their common points of contrast to the native populace. I think there was also deliberate falsification, and that this was one of the many attempts of the Jews to improve their prestige with the Romans, and so gain further advantages.[1]

But this may be set down as certain, that with the decay of the purer Hellenism of Alexandria, the Jewish Hellenism assumed a more aristocratic position, and the Jews stood out in contrast to the despised and unprivileged natives. With the decay, too, of Greek speculation and of Greek faith, came the just hope that it might be replaced by religion and philosophy of old Hebrew growth. Hence we find this very epoch producing the first attempts to show that Greek and Hebrew wisdom had a common origin, to show that old Greek poets and Hebrew prophets walked by the same light, and were the apostles of the same great truths. A beginning was made by means of literary frauds and strained interpretations. Sibylline oracles were forged, lines interpolated,[2] and texts of Scripture accommodated. Presently there was called in aid the fashion of allegorising, which had made some progress in Greek theology,

[1] Strange to say, Schürer, in his admirable *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes* etc. (ii. 533), accepts the dictum of Josephus, and believes that in all the Syrian and even Asianic cities the Jews were settled with the same rights as the Macedonians and Greeks. So also does Dr. Edersheim. I think this impossible to reconcile with Polybius, our best and most unprejudiced witness. It is interesting to note how the prejudices of race bias men's minds on this question. Every Jewish inquirer upholds the fulness of the Jewish privileges, every anti-Semite denies them.

[2] Thus, in proof of Homer's knowledge of the Sabbath, the line *Od.* v. 262 was read, ἑβδόμον ἦμαρ ἔην καὶ τῷ τετέλεστο ἅπαντα, and a passage on the unity of God was composed for Sophocles (Clement *Strom.* 5, 14).

and the too material or too Semitic features in the Old Testament were softened by this means.

The principal name in this stage of the fusion is Aristobulus, who is called by the Jews a tutor of Ptolemy Philometor, and who wrote a *Commentary on the Mosaic Law*, of which fragments are quoted by Clemens and Eusebius. In this book the personal and quasi-human acts and feelings of Jehovah were all explained away as allegories. The often striking coincidences between Mosaic and Hellenic wisdom were not yet accounted for by a common inspiration, or original unity of divine truth, but by old contact of learned Greeks with Palestine, or the spread of forgotten translations of the law of Moses. It was not till far later, under the early Roman empire, that Philo attempted that philosophical fusion of Semitic and Hellenic thought which developed into the mystic doctrines of neo-Platonism. Perhaps we may make a solitary exception of the remarkable Wisdom of Solomon, probably written at this time,[1] which gives the Semite wisdom of Solomon in a form strongly coloured by both Platonic and Stoic thought. This is perhaps the highest and noblest expression of earlier Alexandrian Judaism. But it can hardly be called the most characteristic. I think it very noteworthy that the historical novel with a serious moral purpose was now the favourite form of Jewish literature, and one which was not only very rare in Greek literature, but was not adopted by the Alexandrians. This feature in the early Greek Jewish books came to them from the Hebrew books of the period, which were at first translated into Greek, before men used the new tongue freely enough to compose in it. A whole series of books, beginning perhaps with Esther and Daniel,

[1] Cf. Bissell *Comm. on the Apocrypha* pp. 224-228, in Lange's *Comm. on Script.*

but certainly including the list already given,[1] treat the former history of the Jews with such freedom as to be almost fictions, while using historical names, preserving historical characters, and all illustrating the providence and protection of Jehovah extended to those of His chosen people who were steadfast to His law. This very serious use of fiction, for I hardly think that the authors can have been unconscious of their inventions and transferences of facts, as an adaptation of history to moral and patriotic purposes, became a leading fashion in the Christian Church, but was quite foreign to Hellenistic ideas. We have indeed, in the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon, a romance intended as a treatise on education, but I cannot find any such tendency in the later prose fiction. The prose tales of Alexandria were either love stories, such as I have already discussed, or tales of wonder and adventure, such as the romances about Alexander, which were at this very time growing up in Egypt. In all these there is no more serious motive than to astonish and to amuse. Here then we have Semitic seriousness, an earnest feeling for patriotism and nationality, contrasted with the frivolity of Hellenism.

Thus we note a decrease in the purity and intensity of Alexandrian Hellenism at the very time that Rome was attracting the learning and acuteness of the Greeks. After Aristarchus there was no great master at the Museum; the only literature which flourished in the succeeding generations was the epigram. How far philosophers and men of letters were now gathering to Rome will appear when we come to follow Hellenism to its new home, or new exile, in the capital of Italy.[2]

It would be very interesting to know how the Greek

[1] Above, pp. 517 *sq.* [2] Cf. my *Greek World under Roman Sway*.

population of Antioch fared during this literary decay of Alexandria. From some points of view it must have been gaining ground in Hellenism. Antiochus the Great brought back from his campaign in Greece a large number of Euboeans, Boeotians, and other pure Greeks, to swell the population of his capital, and it is probable that he began that great enlargement of the city which was continued and completed with great splendour by his son Epiphanes.[1] The Hellenistic fervours of this prince have already been discussed. But after his death the constant wars of succession, and rapid rise and fall of kings in the later Seleucid history, account sufficiently for the decay of political importance in the great Syrian city, even apart from the dominance of Western politics. This too is certain, that if the Jews increased in importance in Alexandria, they must have done so still more in Antioch, since the rise of the Maccabees had made Judaea independent, and given her rulers the title of king. The later Maccabee sovrans, Alexander and Aristobulus, were quite powerful enough to make their race respected among the people of Antioch. We may therefore assume an intensifying of Jewish influence, and so far a decay of Hellenism even in Antioch, though unfortunately we have no Antiochene literature to give us any light upon the subject. Syrian Hellenism had never been dominant in letters. We only hear a stray philosopher called a native of Apamea or Seleucia on the Tigris. But from this time onward till the days of Christianity the great cities on the Orontes and the Nile, though populous and busy as ever, cease to be political centres, and to

[1] Strangely enough Strabo (p. 750) does not mention this active and victorious king as an enlarger of Antioch, but after the foundation (above, p. 327) tells of a spontaneous overflow of population, then of Seleucus Callinicus, and then of Epiphanes, as enlargers of the city into four distinct parts.

sway the fortunes or the ideas of the world. In contrast to this decaying and colourless condition, we have the strong individuality of the Jews making itself felt, and farther off the mass of the Eastern Semites, under the Aryan but oriental Parthians, as well as the southern Egyptians, reasserting their spiritual life and showing those indelible characteristics which had been covered with a varnish of Greek letters and laws. But though the original grain reappears as the varnish wears off, the substance never resumes its old surface.

In the case of Antioch, another terrible enemy began at this very time to show its hideous force. In the year 148 B.C. occurred the first of that great series of earthquakes, which in ten several visitations, reaching over seven centuries, at last accomplished the complete ruin of the city in the end of the sixth century A.D. The poor attempts to revive it in mediaeval and modern times have met with a similar fate; for we hear of earthquakes in 1115 and again in 1822, crushing what remained of human industry.[1] This is the reason why the city of the Orontes can show no ruins like Baalbec and Palmyra, whose splendid temples and colonnades were once as nothing compared to the foundation of Seleucus.

[1] Cf. K. O. Müller *Antiqq. Antioch* § 5.

CHAPTER XXII

POLYBIUS AND HIS AGE

It remains for us now to take stock of all the various accounts we have kept with various branches of Hellenism, and form a general estimate of the state of the eastern Mediterranean lands when they fell under the power of Rome. For from this time until the further pacification produced by the Empire, and more especially the reforms then carried out in the administration of the provinces, a complete intellectual and social lethargy pervades the states which had so long been the most brilliant centres of culture. There is nothing to record after the death of Polybius but the occasional passage of Roman armies through Greece, the fierce requisitions made upon the cities of Asia Minor, their retaliation by the massacres of the Mithradatic war, and the terrible devastations occasioned by the great campaigns and battles among the rival claimants for the sovranty of Rome. Pharsalia, Philippi, Actium, were all Roman civil conflicts fought on Greek soil. No literature or art flourished amid the political apathy and the military agitations of this doleful epoch.

We close then with the fall of Corinth, and the subjugation of Greece by Mummius, and we are here fortunate in being able to interrogate perhaps the most competent witness

of antiquity on the general condition of the world, concerning the changes made by the Roman conquest of the East both in the realms of Hellenism and within the conquering city itself. Polybius was the scion of an important family, brought up in the most aristocratic society of the Achaean League, trained to politics by his father and the other leading Achaean politicians, and to arms in the school of Philopoemen. He lived in the midst of the complicated wars and diplomacies from the opening of the second century to the end of his country's independence. He was, moreover, not only exiled with the 1000 Achaeans, and so compelled to live for years in Italy, but by the fortunate accident of some literary correspondence with P. Aemilius, was made the inmate of that great man's house, and became the intimate of the celebrated Scipio Aemilianus. He saw the destruction of Carthage and of Corinth; he visited Alexandria after the furies of Physcon, and he lived long enough, after all the crisis was over, to compose in the leisure of old age, and amid the gratitude and affection of those around him, the great history of which we have some books, many excerpts and many fragments, but of which we deplore the now lacerated condition. The extracts which appear all through this volume will have shown the reader what precious materials he has preserved for us, and what a mine of knowledge has been lost with the disappearance of the larger portion of his forty books. For it was perhaps the greatest *universal history*, or history of all the civilised world, attempted in old times.

I intend in the following pages to gather from his work those additional indications of life and manners for which I could find no convenient place in my earlier chapters, and so bring into a general view many interesting but isolated details. But these will not be estimated at their

proper value unless we give some further account of the mind and temper of Polybius, his philosophy of religion and of life, his theories of morals and of laws, and his consequent qualifications as a witness to observe so large and various a field. For this purpose we can only consult a single source, the actual remains of his history which are still preserved to us.

As we might expect from the man's good birth, his familiarity with the best people in Greece, and his long intimacy in the houses of the greatest nobles in the world, there is an aristocratic tone about him which constantly pierces through his accounts of the democratic patriots that led the last despairing struggle against Rome. For example, Chaeron of Sparta, who had been on an embassy to Rome about 204 B.C., and who returned to do great mischief by socialist agitation in his city (ὀχλαγωγῶν), is described as 'a man of sharp wits and a talent for politics, but a low young fellow with the education of the common people.'[1] Again, when describing one of those late meetings of the League at Corinth, where mad resolutions were passed against Rome, he explains it by saying 'that a crowd of working people and artisans were assembled such as never had met before; for all the Achaean cities at that time were drivelling (ἐκορύζων), and most of all the whole population of Corinth.' These various remarks confirm completely what Freeman has long since shown, that the temper and working of the Achaean League had been essentially timocratic, and by consequence aristocratic, so that a leading man like Polybius felt himself distinctly one of the higher classes, as opposed to the masses.

The policy of the league in his day was rather one of

[1] ἄνθρωπος ἀγχίνοιις μὲν καὶ πρακτικός, νέος δὲ καὶ ταπεινὸς καὶ δημοτικῆς ἀγωγῆς τετευχώς xxiv. 7.

diplomacy than of force. The wisdom and ingenuity of his party was rather directed to mediation and compromise than to carrying out a strong foreign policy; accordingly we find in him a marked taste for diplomacy as such, for arguing international questions on the basis of previous treaties and acknowledged rights, so that he has left us on these questions more materials than any other ancient historian. But for all that his military training had not been neglected. He seems to have been more a theorist than a practical man, and to have had a greater taste for cavalry than infantry service;[1] but his large knowledge enabled him to give us the only full and trustworthy account of the Roman military system—its various services, its camps, its discipline in war, and its tactics in battle. He even takes credit for the invention of a better system of fire signals, substituting the great principle of indicating the letters of each word by a signal, and so spelling out a message, for the older plan of signifying facts by varying numbers of lights. He thus anticipated the principle of the modern heliograph, if we substitute fire lights visible at night for sun flashes.[2] Nevertheless, though the vanity of the Greeks afterwards led them to assert that Scipio Aemilianus's victories were won by Polybius's advice and direction,

[1] See his curious chapter on cavalry drill, x. 23.

[2] Perceiving that the messages to be conveyed are far too complex to be represented by any ideographic system, he tells us that the only serviceable plan is to *spell out* the message, and accordingly, dividing the alphabet of twenty required letters into four groups of five, he proposes to indicate first the *group* by so many successive flashes starting from the left, and then the *letter* of this group by flashes starting from the right, so that a system of five flashes set in a horizontal line, and never showing more than one at a time, will answer all purposes. He describes a very ingenious earlier system of one Aeneas, and says that he himself had worked out the details of the new system first suggested by Cleoxenus and Democleitus.—Cf. x. 43 47.

there is no evidence that he was reputed a great practical general.

Let us rather turn to his many declarations on religion or philosophy—for philosophy was now a religion—and see what this shrewd and experienced practical politician had set up as his rule in life. In many places he shows his strong love and reverence for truth, though many men and cities may have prospered by far different principles. Thus in commenting on the career of Philip's admiral Heraclides, the ruffian who had set up altars to lawlessness and impiety (xviii. 54) when he harried the Aegean islands, Polybius says: 'Nature, it seems to me, makes it plain to mankind that truth is the highest divinity, and assigns to her the highest powers. For though all men try to overcome her, and all that is plausible is allied with falsehood, she, of her own power, insinuates herself, I know not how, into the hearts of men, and sometimes forthwith manifests her authority, sometimes again, after being a long time obscured, finally prevails through her own force and overcomes falsehood.'[1]

This feeling for truth is strongly allied to the belief in a moral government of the world, a government made manifest to all by the punishment of those who have committed crimes and have escaped the ordinary justice of men. Thus he describes in pathetic language the horror and the gloom which beset the closing years of King Philip V. 'For fortune, as if desirous to exact punishment from him in due season for all the impiety and lawlessness of his life, then set round him (as it were) the furies and the avengers of those who had endured misery at his hands, which, never leaving him night or day, took from him such terrible satisfaction, up to the day of his death, as made all the world

[1] xiii. 5.

acknowledge the proverbial "eye of justice," which no man can afford to despise.'[1] And he goes on to prove his case by quoting details of the family tragedy in which the father put his favourite son to death, and then discovered that he had been duped by the survivor.

As regards the lesser vices of men he declares himself principally against meanness, and that in two forms, want of ambition or self-respect, especially in rulers, and parsimony or greed in money matters. He inveighs against Ptolemy VII., the young Philometor, when opposed to Antiochus Epiphanes, for yielding even temporarily to the advice of his tutor, and consenting to retire with ample treasure to Samothrace, instead of taking upon him the cares and dignities of a great sovranty. He derides and reviles King Perseus all through his career for miserable parsimony. He is quite amusing on the diplomacy which went on between Perseus and Eumenes II. of Pergamum, who 'ran a dead heat' in stinginess,[2] and digresses to show how this vice ruined all Perseus's policy by marring all his higher interests, while Eumenes's greed well-nigh lost him his kingdom. It is the shabbiness of states and princes in his own day, when compared with their splendid liberality to Rhodes after the great earthquake, which persuades him of the decay of Hellenism.

I may relieve these graver cases by the amusing story he tells of an Aetolian miser called Alexander, who was sent with others on an embassy to Rome just after the battle of Magnesia (190 B.C.), but was seized on the way by the Epirotes, then at war with the Aetolians. 'It happened that this Alexander was the richest man in Greece, and the other ambassadors not so, but far inferior to him in wealth. And at first the Epirotes demanded a ransom of five talents

[1] xxiii. 10.

[2] *ἱερὸν ποιήσαντες τὸν στέφανον τῆς φιλαργιρίας* xxix. 8.

from each. This seemed rather hard on the others, but yet they were willing to give in, as they thought their own safety the main thing to secure; but Alexander refused, as the sum seemed to him monstrous, and he spent sleepless nights lamenting over himself if he must really pay five talents. Meanwhile the Epirotes, foreseeing that the Romans might hear of it and order them to let free the ambassadors, came down to three talents, which they demanded from each. The rest jumped at this offer and departed, having given security for the money, but Alexander said he would not give more than one talent, for that even this was a great deal, and so at last despairing of himself he remained in captivity, an elderly man with a fortune of more than 200 talents.' We see by this that £50,000 was still an immense private fortune in Greece. 'It seems to me that he would have surrendered his life rather than the three talents. But chance rewarded his parsimony, so that he even gained praise and approval from all for his absurdity, for a few days later there came an order from Rome to release him, and he alone got off without any ransom at all.'[1]

Such being Polybius's views on practical morals, what was his higher philosophy? Evidently of the Stoic type, as appears both from his ideas and his language.[2] And this accounts for the combination of advanced scepticism as regards the religion of the day with a deep sense of divine providence, and of one God ruling the world. He is indeed never tired of telling us that man, apparently the most in-

[1] xxi. 26.

[2] It is a remarkable fact that Polybius never mentions Panaetius, the leading Stoic philosopher of the day, whom he must have met constantly in Scipio's house. I suspect there may have been some jealousy or dislike in Polybius's mind to a rival Greek adviser of his patron. Cicero (*de Reputh.* i. 21) represents them as both taking part in discussions at Scipio's house.

ventive and clever of animals, is really one of the stupidest; for hundreds of cities have been taken by treachery and by the violation of fair promises, yet still you will find new cities and other men, who, though they know all this, will trust the same promises and rush into the same snare.[1] He expresses his astonishment, in the case of Prusias,[2] that the same man can at one moment pray and supplicate at the altars of the gods, 'falling on his knees and behaving like a woman,'[3] and at another ravage and plunder the shrines of these very gods in an enemy's country.

It is probably this contempt for the mass of mankind which gives a Machiavelian complexion to much of his political philosophy. He tells us that systematic villainy is more readily condoned than exceptional and unexpected wickedness, and in this way accounts for the high position of the Aetolian League; but his ideal state is one where religion has been established and is observed, not because it is true, but because its sanctions affect the masses who require some restraint beyond that of reason and justice. Here is a remarkable passage,[4] which I quote because it surely represents the attitude of many thoughtful men in the period before us. 'The exceptional point in favour of the Roman state is its attitude towards the gods; and it seems to me that what others blame in that people [no doubt Hellenistic sneers] really sustains Roman affairs, I mean their superstition; for this point has been so paraded by them, and introduced both into private life and public affairs, as to leave no possibility of going any farther. It may seem wonderful to many, but I think the Romans did so for the sake of the mob. For if it were possible to collect a whole society of wise men, this kind of thing would

[1] xviii. 40.
[2] xxxii. 27.
[3] γονιπετῶν καὶ γυναικιζόμενος.
[4] vi. 56.

perhaps not be necessary, but when every multitude is treacherous and full of lawless desires, irrational impulses and violent passions, nothing remains but to control it by mysterious fears and scenic effects. Wherefore the ancients appear to me to have introduced their notions of the gods and their views of Hades among the populace not at random or in any chance way, nay rather men nowadays try to expel them at random and without good sense. The result is—to specify one point—that public men among the Greeks, if they be trusted with but one talent, though you take ten copies of the deed and affix ten seals and have twenty witnesses, cannot keep their trust, whereas among the Romans, though handling great sums in their offices and embassies, men hold to their duty under the simple bond of an oath. Elsewhere it is hard to find a man keeping his hands off public money, and pure in this respect; at Rome it is hard to find a man guilty of such dishonest conduct.'[1]

Let me quote one more passage[2] on this political view of religion. Speaking of a statue at Iasos in Asia Minor, which, though uncovered, was alleged by certain historians as well as by common local tradition never to be wet with rain or snow, he adds: 'But I somehow find myself all through my history opposing with impatience such assertions of historians. For it seems to me that to state what is not only beyond the limits of reasonable speculation but even of possibility shows an altogether childish frame of mind. To say then that some bodies placed in sunlight cast no shade is the assertion of a stagnant (ἀπηλγηκυίας) mind, as in the case of Theopompus, when he says that people who enter the sacred enclosure

[1] We shall see presently how rapidly the moral tone of the Romans changed with their foreign conquests.

[2] xvi. 12.

of Zeus in Arcadia become shadowless. What I have just mentioned is another case of it. So far then as it tends to preserve the spirit of religion in the masses, we must excuse some of the historians who tell fables and wonders of this kind; but whatever is in excess of this, must be censured. Of course the exact limit in each case is hard to define, but yet this is by no means impossible.'

As regards the general politics of Polybius, his large experience told him that all resistance, except by way of diplomacy, to the Roman power was absurd; he moreover undertook to justify this dominion as the inevitable result of that providence or fortune—the two are with him nearly identical—which rules the affairs of men. This providence was justified by the superior moral character and public spirit of the Romans when they set out upon the conquest of the world, and though, when that conquest was completed, the internal virtues of Rome became rapidly transformed into vices, it was then an accomplished fact, and must be submitted to as the decree of fate. His general views on states and statescraft are given in a famous passage[1] in which he modifies the doctrines of Plato, but in general agrees with the view that all human constitutions are of terminable growth, and naturally prone to decay by reason of the abuse of power common to all men. Whenever any individual or section of the community gains power, and finds restraints removed, and when the memory of the earlier condition becomes faint, such governing sections abuse their power and deprave their state, so as to bring about either their own destruction, or its reversal to another type. Thus in his own day, though he does not here illustrate it in this way, the moderate democracies were degenerating into *chiro-cracies*, being ruled by mob violence, while the monarchies

[1] vi. 3.

were passing, or had passed, into tyrannies. He goes on to show that as Sparta had been sustained for centuries by the theoretical genius of Lycurgus, who had so balanced the monarchical, aristocratical, and democratical elements as to afford mutual checks and safeguards, so by the operation of practical good sense the Romans had accomplished a similar result, and for that reason had conquered the world. He foresaw, indeed, in the distance the decay of Rome also. The corruption which came rushing in with the conquest of the East did not escape his ken. But for the present he justifies the domination Rome had attained from the natural course of events, by that divine providence which men call Fortune, and so he preaches political resignation to the Hellenistic world.

But this is combined with a strong taste for diplomacy in lesser matters, and for the urging of constitutional points in seeking to limit the threatening despotism of new, and somewhat coarse, masters. Hence the evident delight he takes in reproducing this kind of discussion, of which we shall presently produce some examples.

As for the old feeling of city patriotism, such as we know it in men like Epaminondas or Demosthenes, Polybius regards it as mere stupid bigotry. He turns aside specially to censure Demosthenes's random use of the word *traitor* for anybody who did not subordinate all other interests to that of the autonomy of the orator's city, and shows that many sensible politicians in that day had been justified by expediency in siding with Macedon—the Arcadians, for example, had liberated themselves from the domination of a nearer and more oppressive neighbour, Sparta—while the policy of Demosthenes only failed to bring ruin upon Athens owing to the mercy of the conqueror. It is a question, he says, of degree, and of motive,

not of principle, whether we should side with a foreign power against a section of our own citizens.[1] He does not cite Phocion, but he evidently thinks such a man the right man in the right place. So far removed were now the wisest and noblest men from the splendours of Hellenic patriotism!

As regards his literary qualifications, we can judge them not only from his own work but from his copious criticism of other historians. It was an age of conscious and captious writing. Everybody was surrounded by literary observers, and praised or censured in accordance with all kinds of standards, social, political, and philosophic. In a very instructive passage,[2] in which he criticises at great length the Rhodian historians Zeno and Antisthenes, he divides historians into those who write for pay, meaning, no doubt, the many pamphleteers who wrote for kings and commonwealths whatever was suited to the politics or the vanity of the patrons; those who wrote from the rhetorical point of view; and those who really wrote as political thinkers, and for the profit of mankind. He is quite ready to acknowledge the value and the attraction of rhetorical splendour, though, as I have already said, he is so far removed from the golden age of Greek historiography, that he seems perfectly ignorant of the merits of Herodotus and Thucydides, perhaps even of Demosthenes, for he quotes Demetrius Phalereus as the acme of all perfection. But while admiring rhetoric so highly, and, no doubt, appreciating his own style far above its merits, he perceives that rhetorical descriptions are apt to disguise or pervert the truth, and in descriptions of battles especially, to hide the

[1] It is more than likely that he found this argument very fully stated in the *Memoirs* of Aratus, by way of justifying the surrender of the Achaean League to Antigonus Doson.

[2] xvi. 14 *sq.*

real truth altogether. Such were the current accounts of the battles of Issus by Ephorus and Callisthenes,[1] and of the battle of Panion[2] by Zeno in the passage now before us.

But the mistakes of Zeno, a serious and honourable historian; were due to other causes also. Apart from his weakness for rhetorical display, he did not study the geography of his narrative, and he was inclined to distort facts to increase the glory and hide the defeats of his native city, Rhodes. Polybius is very tender to this sin of over-patriotism, but thinks Zeno should hardly have gone so far as to describe a defeat as a victory, when the official despatch from the admiral was still extant in the archives of the Prytaneum at Rhodes. As regards Zeno's geographical errors, in which he describes Nabis going from Sparta by Sellasia to Messene—which is like going from Corinth by the Isthmus to Mycenae[3]—he thought it proper to write to Zeno, and point out the mistake. Zeno received the criticism with good temper, at which Polybius seems to have been somewhat agreeably surprised, but as the book was *published* there was no remedy. Polybius himself invites his readers to send him similar corrections, whenever he may

[1] xii. 17.—He shows here that the alleged numbers of the Persian army were such as could not possibly fit into the plain of Issus north of the river Pinarus. It may be added that the feeding of such enormous multitudes as Greek vanity alleged to have marched against Alexander would be plainly impossible even with our roads and railways. All the numbers set down in ancient accounts of battles are thoroughly untrustworthy, especially the numbers of the slain, which the historians deliberately falsified on patriotic grounds.

[2] Near the sources of the Jordan, in which Antiochus the Great defeated the Egyptian forces under Scopas the Aetolian, 198 B.C. Cf. the description of the place in Joseph. *Antiq.* xv. 10, § 3.

[3] Note his own false use of points of the compass here he speaks of Mycenae as *west* of Corinth, and the isthmus as east.

have made mistakes, owing to the length and complexity of his subject. He also draws a careful distinction between clerical errors, or mistakes of the copyists, and real errors in the author's knowledge.

A similar proof of the self-conscious and critical temper of the times is afforded by his note on the alternation of the first and third person in his own narrative.[1] 'You must not wonder if we designate ourselves at times by our proper name, at others by the use of the plural, viz. "when Polybius said this," and again, "when we had arranged." For as we were much implicated in the events that are about to be narrated, it was necessary to vary our own designation, lest we should either offend by the tautology of always repeating the same name, or by constantly using *I* and *we* become offensive, but rather by judicious variations escape, as far as possible, the fault of talking about ourselves, since such writing is naturally unpleasing, though it is often unavoidable in explaining what happened. And so far chance has helped us in this matter that up to our day nobody, so far as we know, ever inherited my name.' When he became celebrated, and statues were raised to him by grateful cities in Peloponnesus, many people were called after him. But the passage before us shows how full of self-consciousness the man was, and what criticism he expected. This is also plain from his own unsparing censure of earlier authors, such as Timaeus, whom he ridicules for being a pedant in his study, and reading books when he should have been studying men and things. We shall revert to this controversial side hereafter.

Such was the atmosphere in which this great man lived. We have elsewhere spoken of his love for sport, and his contempt for special bodily training, other than that for

[1] xxxvii. 4.

strictly military purposes. The Olympic games were still popular and crowded, but from the scene there which he has described[1] it appears that boxing was now the chief sport, and that the old national feelings of the spectators were giving way to a mere admiration of professional display. 'Cleitomachus,' he says, 'was the most famous athlete in all Greece, and all the world knew of him, when King Ptolemy [we know not which], desirous to pull down his fame, took all pains to have a new boxer trained and sent to Olympia to compete with him. The coming contest excited great interest, and all the crowd favoured the new man, Aristonicus, for his pluck, and for the chance of seeing the champion beaten; so that when the fight began and seemed even, and presently Aristonicus got in an effective blow, the whole crowd shouted applause. Then they say that Cleitomachus, standing back to recover breath, turned to the crowd and asked them what they meant by encouraging Aristonicus, and backing him as much as they could. Was it that they did not think he himself was fighting fair, or that they did not know that he was fighting for the glory of Greece, but Aristonicus for that of King Ptolemy? Would they prefer an Egyptian to carry off the Olympic prize from the Greeks, or a Theban and Boeotian to be proclaimed victor? Whereupon there was so sudden a reversal in public sentiment that Aristonicus was vanquished more by the crowd than by Cleitomachus.' I suspect this amounted to positive interference with the combatants.

The reader may be surprised that I devote so much space to the character and opinions of Polybius, when my concern is with the age which he describes. But there is no better way of attaining a general conception of the epoch than by studying its reflection in the writings of a man who

[1] xxvii. 9.

was in many senses the mirror of his age. There are, of course, some limitations to be carefully observed. In the first place, if he was below the teaching of the highest philosophers in his Machiavelian contempt for the human race, and in his preaching of expediency as the only true motive in politics, he must, on the other hand, have been far above the average of that or any other society in intellect. As regards his circumstances also, it is impossible that a man enjoying the extraordinary privileges which he did in the house of Paullus Aemilius and his great adopted son, should not have felt himself bound to magnify Roman virtue generally, and the Scipionic virtues especially, beyond their actual merits. He tells us indeed that his history would be chiefly read by Romans, and we cannot but suspect that he accommodated himself to that public. The acts of Scipio Africanus, as described by him, must have been drawn to some extent from family traditions, which he heard from elder friends and relatives of his pupil. These things make one suspect this house-dog of the Scipios of having been utilised, half unconsciously perhaps, on his part, to exalt the glories and maintain the popularity of a great and ambitious house.

But enough of these detractions from our precious and only eye-witness to the condition of that brilliant age. Let us leave Polybius himself and endeavour to draw from his work, and from the later historians, a picture of the condition of decaying Hellenism, before we pursue it (in another volume) to Rome, and there see it in its new and strange habitation.

Perhaps the greatest source of the decay of Hellenism was the almost sudden depopulation of Greece itself, the real home and centre from whence everything great in Greek Asia and Egypt was confessedly derived. Let us hear Polybius upon this subject.[1] 'I, who censure those that

[1] xxxvii. 9.

refer their public deeds and private misfortunes to fate or chance, now desire to apply the same principles to historical criticism. Where it is impossible or very hard for human knowledge to discover the causes, a man may perhaps in his perplexity have recourse to the Deity or to fortune: *e.g.* to explain a sudden excess of rain and waterfloods, or else of drought or frost, bringing with them failure of crops. Such are also frequent epidemics, and other things of which we can give no account. It is natural then that in such cases we should fall in with the notions of the public in our perplexity, offering sacrifices and prayers to appease the Deity, and sending to ask the gods by what words or acts we might improve our condition and obtain some relief from pressing ills. But where it is possible to discover the cause which produced the result, I do not think we should refer such things to the Deity. Here is an example. In our own times all Greece suffers from childlessness and general want of population, through which both cities have become deserted and cultivation of land has ceased, although neither protracted wars nor visitations of pestilence have afflicted us. Now should any one propose to ask the advice of the gods by what course we might increase and populate our cities, would he not appear silly when the cause is manifest and the remedy lies in our own hands? For men have turned to ostentation and to love of money and selfishness, so that either they will not marry, or if they do, will not support the children they have beyond one or at most two, whom they can provide for richly and bring up in idle luxury—and so the mischief has quickly grown upon us ere we observed it. For when there are only one or two children in the house, if war or disease carry one of them off, houses must come to be left desolate, and like hives of bees, cities of men must fail. About this then there is no

need to consult the gods; any common man can tell us that we can best of all find the remedy in ourselves, by repenting of this love of riches, and if that is not done, by making laws that children must be brought up [by their parents?]. There is no need of prophets or visions here.'

This is a new reason added to those which I have stated long ago for the depopulation of Greece. The mercenaries brought back quantities of money, as the Spaniards did from America to Spain. Luxury increased, and with it both the style of living and the prices went up. Industry, however, and the power of producing from the soil diminished with the disappearance of the best part of the working population. So the money which had been brought in went out again for luxuries, and left the many poor, while their artificial wants increased. The few who were thrifty or had capital became very rich, and then there was the usual cry that the world was unfairly divided. There were, in consequence, the attempts at plunder by new land laws, or by excessive taxing, which are often proposed in our own day by the Socialists; and as one kind of immorality seldom prevails without another, those who wished to plunder their richer neighbours or who hugged their own wealth also forgot their duties to the commonwealth, and refused the trouble and expense of bringing up children. I said above (p. 130) that the crime of exposing infants, though not considered such by Greek laws, and used as a frequent device in theatrical plots, was not, in my opinion, really common. At this later day, when Greece was prostrate and dying, the evidence of Polybius is too clear to be gainsaid. The same kind of immorality prevails, as we know, in France, perhaps too in American cities, and in London; but medical practice and modern sentiment have contrived to avoid the scandal of exposing infants, and the same end is attained by interfer-

ing with nature in other ways. The moral causes in both societies are the same—the desire to enjoy the pleasures without the responsibilities of life, and the dislike of toil and thrift as involving nothing but misery.

I must add to this catalogue of vices another disgusting feature of the times—cruelty. I do not now mean the ruthless plundering and murdering and selling into slavery which we see practised by the Romans, and which was regarded as terribly harsh and cruel, though, of course, fair, by the Greeks. It is rather the deliberate infliction of torture, frequently to extract evidence, but oftener by way of punishing one's adversaries. Not only the wild democrats of the Achaean League, such as Diaeus[1] and Critolaus, tortured their political opponents, but the aristocratic Aratus had not scrupled to do it; and we may say that no free man was now, as he once had been, practically safe from torture, even in constitutional societies. We must remember that a slave-owning society is never very far from this horrible vice. Disregard of the human chattel, and the dangerous position of the dominant minority, have always made the masters liable to use torture. We even find at free Athens, in her most civilised days, that in every moment of great panic the public were ready to apply it to free men to extract evidence.[2] But now that absolute monarchy had reappeared as a recognised form of government, in which the sovran had unlimited power over his subjects, the men of once free cities must soon have become accustomed to these horrors; and whenever any revolution brought a politician into absolute

[1] Cf. the shocking cases Polyb. xxxix. 11; also torture at Rhodes, no doubt in a public panic at the Roman threats, xxx. 8; so Polybius says that Hermeias lost his life *without at all paying for his misdeeds* (v. 56). This and the sentence on Achaeus were cited above (pp. 439 *sq.*) But these last cases were in Syrian society.

[2] Cf. my *Social Life in Greece*, Index, *sub voc.* TORTURE.

power, he was imitating not the loathed Greek tyrant, but the splendid king of Egypt or Syria, when he allowed himself to question or punish by these violences. Hence we see in the consolations offered by the philosophies of the day the possibility of torture generally put forward with the boast that even this will not destroy the happiness of the man who has 'found peace.'

This it is which makes the Stoic system always justify suicide as the wise man's escape from greater ills, and no reflection is more frequent in Polybius. High treason being always punished with torture, Molon and Alexander, the insurgent satraps of Antiochus the Great, committed suicide to avoid this fate; and when the principle was once acknowledged, it was obvious that the certainty of disgrace would be avoided in the same way. For to honourable men the agony of shame is less endurable than physical torments. Thus King Perseus was censured for not avoiding by voluntary death his disgrace at the Roman triumph, and his humane conqueror even hinted this to him very broadly.

It is *à propos* of this very crisis that Polybius gives us his views clearly on this subject.[1] When the Romans made their terrible inquisition throughout the Hellenistic world after their victory (168 B.C.), there were three classes of partisans of Perseus threatened with vengeance: those who silently sympathised but had refrained from act or word against Rome, like the Achaean patriots; those who had attempted to drag their fellow-citizens into the war without success; and those who had actually done so. The Molossian leaders were among the last; they met their fate bravely, and died fighting when their executioners came upon them. The Achaeans, on the other hand,

[1] xxx. 6 *sq.*

very properly challenged a fair trial, and cheated all the expectations of their foes; for it is no less ignoble to commit suicide when you are conscious of no crime or baseness, through fear of the threats of political opponents or of kings, than it is to love life beyond what is meet.[1]

The remaining case was that of some citizens of Cos and Rhodes, upon which the historian dilates, not to gloat over their misfortunes, but to show the absurdity of their conduct, and afford a warning to others in similar circumstances.

These men, especially Polyaratus and Deinon of Rhodes, made speeches and wrote letters trying to excite their own and other states to help Perseus, so that not only were many of their fellow-citizens privy to their views, but their correspondence with Perseus was found in his papers and made known, and their emissaries made prisoners by the Romans. 'Yet they could not make up their minds to put themselves out of the way, but still hesitated, so that, holding out for some prospect of life against desperate chances, they sacrificed what reputation they had for boldness and daring, and sacrificed all claim to pity with posterity. For being convicted downright by their own handwriting and their agents they appeared rather shameless than unfortunate. Thoas, a sea merchant, the go-between of Deinon and Perseus, who saw what was coming, fled to Cnidos, and thence was taken by the Rhodians under extradition, and

[1] τοῦ παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον φιλοζώειν. The Spartan king Cleomenes (Plut. *Cleom.* sub fin.) is represented as drawing a similar distinction, and repudiating suicide as cowardice if there be the least hope of yet doing service to one's country. This, therefore, is not quite the extreme theory 'that the wise man should walk out of his house if the chimney smokes,' which we find in Epictetus, and in some of the Roman nobles mentioned by the younger Pliny.

when questioned by torture corroborated every word found in the captured documents; and yet Deinon endured to live till this exhibition of him was made. Polyaratus behaved even worse. For when Popilius directed King Ptolemy to send him to Rome, the king, out of respect for Rhodes and for Polyaratus, thought it right to send him home, adding an account of the circumstances. He, therefore, entrusted him in a special ship to Demetrius, one of his household. But when they touched at Phaselis on the way, Polyaratus escaped to land, and sat as a suppliant at the public hearth of the city. If any one had asked him what he meant by this, I am persuaded he would have had no answer to make. For if he wanted to be brought home, that was the very thing being done for him; but if to Rome, that was going to happen in spite of him. What other alternative was there? *For there was no other place that could receive him with safety.* But when the Phaselitans sent to Rhodes and told them to come and fetch their citizen, the Rhodians very prudently sent a man-of-war to escort him, but forbade their captain to let him into the ship because it was the Alexandrians who were ordered to deliver him at Rome. Accordingly when the Rhodian ship would not receive him, and Demetrius pressed him to embark, as did the Phaselitans, who greatly feared they might get into a scrape with Rome, he got terrified at his situation and came back to the Alexandrian vessel. But finding a favourable chance he ran away again to Caunos, and tried the same game. The Caunians being allies of the Rhodians, and repulsing him, he sent to the people of Cibyra, with whom he had friendly relations, because the children of their dynast, Pancrates, had been educated in his house at Rhodes. These people foolishly consented, and got both him and themselves into still greater trouble. For neither did they dare to keep him, nor

were they able to send him to Rome, as they were an inland people totally unacquainted with ships. So they had to send to Rhodes and to the Roman general in Macedonia, asking them to come and take the man. The general ordered them to send him over to the Rhodians, and directed them to undertake his delivery. So in the end he arrived at Rome, having made as public a display of his folly and meanness as he possibly could, being surrendered all round the eastern world by reason of his own absurdity.'

This passage is worth citing at length for many reasons, and I shall refer to it again in another connexion. But I need hardly say that if Polybius's principles were so grossly violated by these unfortunate people, there were other cases, and prominent ones, where the readiness to commit suicide shows itself not only in individuals but in communities, as a curious feature of the times. The terrible resolution of the Abydenes stands out as a foremost example. Philip V., in spite of the representations of both Rhodian and Roman envoys, had been pressing the siege of Abydos, to which the inhabitants made the most heroic resistance. I have already alluded to this case, where the population, when refused an honourable capitulation, bound themselves by oath to die one and all. 'And seeing the number and the eagerness of those who were slaying themselves and their children and their wives by fire, hanging, drowning, and leaping from the roofs, Philip was alarmed, and grieved at what was taking place, so he said he would give a respite of three days for those who wished to hang or slay themselves. And the Abydenes, having already determined concerning their own condition, and considering themselves as it were traitors to those who fought and died for their country [under the solemn resolution before

adopted], would not endure to live unless they were already constrained by chains, and no longer their own masters; all the rest without hesitation went in families to die.' This is the resolution which Polybius honours with his highest praise, and complains of fortune for annulling their decision, and putting their women and children, about whom they were so desperately resolved, into the hands of their enemies.

We may be sure there was some very vigorous, nay, enthusiastic and extreme Stoic teaching behind these awful facts. But history has left us no clue to the names of the men who could persuade a whole population into such marvellous heroism.

Enthusiasts indeed there were, and very strange ones, as we learn from the story of the massacre of a Roman noble, Octavius, who was sent to Syria when Epiphanes was dead, to demand from his successor the strict observance of the conditions imposed upon the kingdom by Rome, which were: to reduce the army to 5000 men, hamstring all the elephants, and burn all the ships of war. These conditions having been so long neglected as to be really a dead letter, the result was an outburst of public indignation, and a man called Leptines murdered the Roman envoy.[1] Of course a very suppliant embassy was sent by King Demetrius to Rome, with a large present of gold, bringing with them the murderer, and many protestations that the king and court

[1] Appian *Syr.* 46 gives the facts, which can almost all be confirmed from the remaining fragments of Polybius. 'The Romans hearing that there was an army of elephants in Syria, and ships more than the number prescribed in the treaty with Antiochus (III.), sent ambassadors to kill the elephants and burn the ships. And it was a pitiful sight to see the beasts, which were tame and rare, being killed, and the ships burning. So a man in (Syrian) Laodicea, called Leptines, unable to bear the sight, assassinated Cn. Octavius, the head of the embassy, as he was rubbing himself with oil in the gymnasium.' Cicero (*Philipp.* ix. 2) adds that a statue of Octavius was set up on the rostra.

had nothing to do with it. 'The senate refused to receive the murderers, for,' says Polybius, 'the king sent not only Leptines but Isocrates. This was a literary man by profession, and gave public lectures, but being by nature a talker and vain fellow and a bore, he fell foul even of the Greeks, of whom the school of Alcaeus ridiculed him very smartly in controversy. Coming then into Syria and despising his audience, he was not content to lecture about his proper business, but made political pronouncements, saying that Cnaeus had justly suffered, and that every other ambassador should be treated the same way, so as to have not one to report it at Rome, and so stop their proud commands and the insolence of power. Talking in this random way he got into the present scrape, and this is what happened. Leptines immediately after the murder went about openly in (Syrian) Laodicea, boasting that he had done what was right and with the approval of the gods. And when Demetrius had made good his position on the throne, Isocrates went to the king and exhorted him not to fear for the death of Cnaeus, and pass no harsh decree against the Laodiceans, for that he himself would go to Rome and explain to the senate that it was done according to the will of God. So at last he was sent without bonds or guard on account of his readiness and zeal.' I cannot forbear going on with this curious passage. 'Isocrates, when involved in the same charge, went completely off his head, and when he was put into fetters would hardly eat, and abandoned all care of his person. So he came to Rome a wonderful sight, at which any man would confess that both in body and mind nothing is more shocking than a man if he becomes completely savage. For his appearance was as horrible as a wild beast's, when for more than a year he had neither washed, nor trimmed his nails and hair; and

as to his mind he produced such an effect by the expression and rolling of his eyes that any one would rather approach a wild beast. But Leptines stuck to his point, and was ready to go before the senate, and to those about him spoke openly of the affair, and contended that he would suffer no hurt at the hands of the Romans. And in the end his expectations were realised; for the senate, thinking, I suppose, that they would seem to the public to have obtained satisfaction for the murder if they punished those that were surrendered, would not receive them, but kept the case open, in order to use it as a grievance when occasion arose.'

I return from this illustration of the results of tyranny and oppression—the prevalence of, and respect for, suicide—to another feature which shows the increasing savagery of the times. I have already noted repeatedly the rising value of works of art, and the more conscious appreciation of statues and pictures among educated men,[1] and yet nothing is more common now than to hear of the wholesale destruction of them by invading forces. We are far now from the chivalry of the first King Demetrius (above, p. 117), and not only do we find savages like the Galatians and Illyrians rifling ancient tombs and defacing temples, but we find civilised monarchs, especially Philip V. of Macedon, guilty of the most shameful outrages of this kind.[2] The Hellenistic

[1] Thus Polybius (iv. 78) says that the Alpheus, after passing Heraeon, comes to Aliphera, a town on a precipitous hill, having on the highest top a citadel, and in it a bronze statue of Athene, remarkable for size and beauty, but of which the origin and dedication are unknown even to the inhabitants. Every one, however, agreed as to its finish and perfection, and that it must be the work of Hecatodorus and Sostratus (Ol. 100). Even a man whose character was not genuine is called *ψευδεπίγραφος*, apparently a metaphor from forgeries in art.

[2] Cf. Polybius's description of the destruction of the gymnasium, porticoes, and public offerings of Dion (Macedonia) by Scopas (iv. 62), and of Dodona by Dorimachus (iv. 67), both Aetolian chiefs, whose misdeeds the historian tells with special emphasis.

fashion of filling every public thoroughfare with crowds of statues in bronze and marble gave great scope to the exercise of this brutal spirit. More frequently, however, such things, if portable, were carried away to adorn the capital of the victor. In this last feature we know that the Aetolians and the Pergamene kings were the worst offenders.

Nothing will have struck the reader of these pages more than the violent contrasts already indicated—scepticism and credulity, savagery and urbanity, desperation and cowardice, tyranny and diplomacy. But as I have in this chapter so far drawn the darker side, I will now turn to the better features of the age.

There can be little doubt that the manners of ordinary society were far more polished than they had been in the days of the old republics, and in spite of the violences and brutalities that I have mentioned, the every-day Greek in days of peace must have seemed a much more civilised man. Many causes contributed to this. In the first place, there was the now traditional quietist teaching of the New Comedy and of Epicurus,[1] which sought happiness in the escape from disputes, from keenly agitated public questions, from disagreeably earnest people. A great part of the pursuit of happiness consisted in the avoidance of mental disturbances and excitements. The garden of Epicurus, therefore, even more than the Academy of Plato, must have been a school of good manners.

Perhaps a still larger influence was exercised by the establishment of the many Hellenistic kings and their courts, where stately ceremonial and elaborate etiquette put a tight bridle on the rudeness of free speech, and taught men the

[1] Cf. my *Social Life in Greece* chap. xi.

importance of studied politeness.[1] Even hostile kings treated one another with that courtesy which only a privileged order will ever maintain; and the habit of suppressing angry feelings, and using courteous language to conceal bitter hate, must have told on society outside the precincts of the *aula*. Thus the Roman nobles who visited these courts and kings offended everybody by their bluntness and their bad manners. The 'circle of Popilius' shocked Polybius and all the Hellenistic world; Coruncanius paid with his life for his rudeness to Queen Teuta; Marcus Aemilius was only excused by Philip V. for his boorish interruption on the ground that he was young, handsome, and a Roman—by which last is meant that he could not be expected to have any manners. And we may imagine what the manners of Octavius were when his murder was openly justified on the ground of the insolence of Roman envoys.

We must remember that this barbarous bluntness, partly perhaps caused by imperfect knowledge of Greek, came with a peculiar shock upon people accustomed to the etiquette of elaborate diplomacy, and the observation of international courtesy, even in the midst of violations of justice and right. International rights—*τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμιμα, τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας δίκαια*, or whatever else they were called—had been recognised long ago among the many small but distinct states of Greece, and they certainly included several generally obeyed regulations, such as the avoiding the use of poisoned arrows,[2] the releasing of

[1] Cf. as instances the story of Achaeus's capture, above, p. 443; the reception of Apelles, Philip V.'s vizier, above, p. 450; and the conduct of Scopas, above, p. 469. To these instances we may add Plutarch's story (*de garrul.* 17) about the indignation of King Demetrius at the Spartans sending him an embassy consisting of only *one* ambassador.

[2] Cf. my *Social Life in Greece* chap. ii.

prisoners for a fixed ransom,[1] and perhaps the most interesting of all, the formal offer to submit to arbitration which accompanies a statement of grievances, and a threat to appeal to arms. Thus the Romans demand[2] that Philip shall submit to have the damage done to Pergamum estimated before a fair tribunal, and Polybius boasts[3] that long ago, in the crisis of the anti-Pythagorean riots in Magna Graecia, and in the disputes between the Spartans and Thebans, then premier states, after the battle of Leuctra, the Achaeans were made arbitrators of differences among these greater states, just as the Swiss might now be chosen by the great European powers. These questions come up frequently during the Roman dealings with Greece.[4] Thus when Aratus tried to surprise Argos in time of peace, the new tyrant, Aristippus, who had just seized the power, brought a complaint against the Achaean League before the Mantineans as arbitrators, and recovered thirty minae against Aratus. Diplomacy, as the ordinary reader perhaps does not apprehend, meant originally the study and knowledge of *diplomata* or charters, of which many in the Middle Ages were forged, in order to justify encroachments upon property or long usufruct of lands without any real title. It was the constant manufacture of these old documents which led the Jesuit Huet to assert that all our Greek and Latin classics were monkish forgeries of the Middle Ages. We now use the word in its good sense[5] for the practice of settling international questions by discussion, and as dis-

[1] Cf. the admission of this as a Greek custom by Pub. Sulpicius on the capture of Aegina, Polyb. ix. 42, and above, p. 508.

[2] Polyb. xvi. 37.

[3] ii. 39. Grote, however, justly questions the truth of this assertion of Polybius.

[4] Cf. Polyb. xxiii. 2; xviii. 1 *sq.*; xxxii. 17.

[5] For its bad sense of knavery, cf. above, p. 432.

cussion must start from common principles, and these are either rational — justice and expediency, or historical — former inheritances and treaties, we have a very large field for ingenuity of interpretation and subtlety of argument. All civilised nations, and most of all the Greeks, have pretended to adopt these means before appealing to arms, and no protest is thought more valuable than the assertion that we have done what we could to show the justice of our case by pacific argument.

The two indispensable qualities in this diplomacy were *politeness* and *secrecy*. Thus Philip, when meeting Flamininus and the Aetolians (xviii. 1) and expressing fears for his own safety owing to the Aetolian treachery, 'was thought by all to have begun the discussion in a coarse way' (φορτικῶς). Thus Polybius elsewhere specially turns aside to commend the same King Philip for having destroyed all his secret papers after the defeat of Cynoscephalae. 'He acted like a king in not forgetting his duty even in great peril;' and this was a peculiar virtue which Philip showed together with many vices. I suppose Polybius remembered but too well the dreadful results to his country, and, indeed, to all the Greek world, from the seizure of Perseus's papers after the battle of Pydna. He also specially animadverts on a certain Astymedes, who represented Rhodes at this latter moment in Rome, and who did his best to avert the wrath of the republic. 'Now Astymedes thought that he had spoken right well for his country, but he did not at all please the Greeks that were sojourning, or that resided, at Rome. Nay, he presently published his speech in a pamphlet, which appeared to most of those who read it both ill-timed and quite untrustworthy. For he based his defence less on the justice of his country's case than on the accusation of others.' This was done by exaggerating all the good points of Rhodes

in direct comparison with other states, which he sought to degrade and vilify. 'People thought this sort of defence not worthy of a politician, for in such men we do not praise those concerned with secrets who disclose their correspondents through fear or for gain, but rather regard as really good and brave those who submit to any punishment or torture to avoid implicating others. So this man, who in the face of an only probable danger brought all the mistakes of others under the knowledge of the dominant power, and refreshed again what time had cast into oblivion, could hardly escape censure.'[1]

It was this desire of secrecy which made Hellenistic kings often employ as envoys discreet men, such as artists or physicians, who travelled apparently on their own business. This was what Eumenes II. did, and even a Roman general, but in his case it was commented on as strange that a 'gymnastic trainer' should be so employed by the Romans, who were generally very formal in these matters.[2]

In harmony with this fashion of polite discussion when points of difference arose was that of sending formal embassies of congratulation to rival powers, and the more strained the relations the more punctilious was the ceremony. We may be certain that of all the crowd of powers represented by embassies at Rome in 189 B.C., when the world gathered to congratulate the great Republic for the victory of Magnesia and the defeat of Antiochus the Great, very few indeed were sincere in their declarations, and the real sentiments cloaked under formulae of praise were those of suspicion and alarm. But all this was concealed under smiling faces and gifts of golden crowns. Whenever a king of Egypt was proclaimed, the whole world went there also in embassy, perhaps to spy out the land, perhaps to make

[1] Cf. Polyb. xxx. 2, 3. [2] xxvii. 7.

combinations against the young king at his very court, but still official politeness was carefully observed. We saw above how King Prusias took it as an offence nearly amounting to a *casus belli* that the Byzantines had sent a state embassy to the Founders' Feast at Pergamum, whereas they had neglected to do so to his festival at Nicomedia. Here is a narrative from Polybius which illustrates both these features, the courtesy and the diplomacy together.[1]

When Antiochus Epiphanes made his successful expedition into Egypt, and was practically master of the country, it was determined to obtain the interference of neutral powers. So first of all the Privy Council determined to send the Greeks who happened to be staying at Alexandria as ambassadors to discuss a settlement of the war. The gentlemen so present were as follows:—two separate embassies from the Achaean League, one about the renewal of friendly relations (with the young king, who had not long succeeded), another about the festival and competition of the Antigoneia (at Corinth). From Athens there was an embassy about a bounty (from Egypt), and two sacred missions (*θεωρίαι*), one about the Panathenaic festival, and one about the Mysteries. There were besides two men from Miletus and two from Ephesus. With these the young king sent Tlepolemus and Ptolemy the rhetor. Thus we see seven several embassies upon public affairs, and affairs of social import, all at Alexandria together; most of those from Greece seem to have been in quest of subscriptions for games and feasts from richer Egypt.

Antiochus received all these people in the friendliest and most hospitable way, and, after feasting them, gave them audience. First the Achaean, then an Athenian, and thirdly a Milesian made speeches. But as they all spoke on the

[1] xxviii. 19.

same basis and for the same end, their arguments were practically the same; they all laid the blame on Eulaeus (the young king's tutor, who had set on the war by laying claim to Syria), and they all put forward Ptolemy's youth and his family connexion with Antiochus as a reason why the latter should moderate his resentment. But Antiochus, corroborating all this, and even confirming their arguments, proceeded to explain the justness of his claims on historic grounds, and then laying stress on the recent assertion of this in war by his father Antiochus (the Great), denied absolutely the agreement which the Egyptians alleged between the Ptolemy just deceased and Antiochus the Great, that the former was to receive Coele-Syria as dowry when he married Cleopatra, the mother of the present king.

Arguing from these premises, and having persuaded not only himself but all those that heard him of the justness of his cause,[1] he set out for Naucratis. This was the dispute, and this the diplomatic question settled by the brutal Popilius with his walking-stick and his circle in the sand.

Again, we have Philip arguing with Flamininus when he was ordered to liberate all the cities of Greece under his sway. What do you mean by Greece? How do you define it? Most of the Aetolians, with whom the Romans were in league, were not accounted Greeks. He asked might he therefore conquer and possess these? Indeed the whole of this discussion, held under the most peculiar and suspicious precautions, by T. Flamininus and his Greek allies with Philip,[2] and which Flamininus enjoyed thoroughly, is very characteristic of the times. There is nothing which Polybius reports with more evident delight than these dis-

[1] See the closely similar arguments of his father Antiochus III. against Ptolemy Philopator, also given by Polybius v. 67, quoted above, p. 437.

[2] xviii. 1 *sq.*

cussions. Thus on one occasion when an Achaean assembly met at Megalopolis [1] to hear the report of their ambassadors, who brought back a large present (200 talents of copper coin and 6000 bronze weapons) from Egypt, and a polite proposal 'to renew the former treaty,' to which the ambassadors had provisionally agreed, Aristaenus gets up and asks, What treaty? He then proceeds to read out several former treaties inconsistent with one another, and puts the embassy to shame so thoroughly that the whole meeting thought him the only man who knew his business, and agreed to his 'moving the previous question.'

The gift of money, however, was accepted; and this suggests another curious debate at the same meeting, where the king of Pergamum offered a large sum under slightly different circumstances.

Among various embassies sent from Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, with gifts and compliments to the League, there appeared envoys from King Eumenes (II.),[2] offering 120 talents (£25,000) to the League, on condition that it should be put out at interest to provide for the yearly expenses of members of the Council in attending the assemblies of the League. This was proposed with all the politeness possible by the envoys. Whereupon Apollonides of Sicyon rose and said that as far as the amount went, it was a gift worthy of the League, but as regards the intention of the donor and the use he had proposed, it was most disgraceful and illegal. For when the law absolutely forbade any person, either private or official, taking any gift whatsoever from the king,

[1] xxii. 10.

[2] Dr. Dörpfeld has now identified the stoa he built at Athens, leading from the Greek theatre to the site afterwards occupied by that of Hadrian. Cf. *Mitth.* xiii. 101. See further *BCH* v. 374 on a feast founded by Eumenes II. at Delphi; and also concerning Attalus II. in *BCH* v. 162.

nothing could be more illegal than to be bribed *en masse* by receiving this money, and what was worse, receiving it publicly. For that the Council should be regaled every year by Eumenes, and then deliberate on public affairs, having, so to speak, swallowed the bait, was plainly mean and mischievous. Eumenes was making offers now, presently Prusias would do so, by and by Seleucus; but as monarchies and republics had natural antipathies, and as from these differences arose most of their own relations to kings, either it would result that the interests of these kings would be preferred to patriotic measures, or that those who opposed their paymasters would be considered ungrateful to them. Apollonides therefore proposed the rejection of the gift as an insult to the League. The assembly being further reminded by an Aeginetan present that Aegina had been bought by Attalus I. for thirty talents from the Aetolians, when they and the Romans had taken it in the recent war, the rejection of this great gift was voted with loud acclamations.

Eumenes II. indeed incurred such odium throughout Greece by his father's campaigns in Greece,[1] and by his opportunism, which made him take the Roman side in the quarrels of the day, that all his statues set up by grateful cities in the Peloponnesus had been overturned and the votive inscriptions effaced. This was regarded so grave a thing in those days that we hear of a regular diplomatic mission to have them restored, and the king's brother Attalus appeared at an Achaean assembly, where there was a long and doubtful debate on the point (xxviii. 7). It seems that those who carried out the previous order had exceeded their powers, as Polybius himself contended at the meeting.

[1] Attalus I. had helped to capture Oreus, Carystos, Eretria, Andros, and had taken from them (by consent of the Romans) much spoil.

He argued, I suppose with politic falsehood, that as the decree against Eumenes had only been intended to prevent excessive and fulsome honours, so now the assembly should remedy the excess which had been shown in doing him dishonour. Ultimately it was carried that Attalus should receive the compliment he sought for his brother, and that not only the statues, but what was thought more important, the panegyrical inscriptions,[1] should be restored.

I will only cite one more instance of the public courtesy of the times, afforded us by the visit of Attalus I., the predecessor of Eumenes II., to Athens. He was formally invited to come and confer with Roman envoys and with the Athenians about the outrages of Philip. Having had a private conference with the Romans, as soon as he arrived, at the Peiraeus, he made his state entry, together with the Roman envoys, next day. The hospitalities had been voted by public decree of the city. Not only all the magistrates, with the knights, but the whole body of citizens, with their wives and children, came out to meet him. This last particular, the wives and children, is the Hellenistic feature of the affair. There was boundless enthusiasm. When he entered at the Dipylon the street within was lined with priests and priestesses. After this they opened all the temples, and bringing victims begged him to sacrifice. Finally they established a new tribe, to be called after him, so placing him in the rank of an 'eponymous hero.' But when they invited him to address their assembly he excused himself and said it would be offensive to appear in person and rehearse his benefits to those who had received them. So they did not press him, but asked for a written com-

[1] xxvii. 18 *μὴ μόνον τὰς ἀναθηματικὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐγγράπτους τιμάς.* We have now the text of such a dedication to Attalus II., the prince in question, from Aptera in Crete. Cf. *BCH* iii. 426.

munication of his views. He did not scruple to take credit in this letter for his benevolences, by way of preamble to a strong recommendation to declare war against Philip. Yet this was the man who had bought and 'enslaved' Aegina!

In summing up this fragmentary picture of the Hellenistic states which were now being swallowed up by Rome, I must remind the reader that our evidence is almost wholly confined to public men and matters, and that, even there, vices are always more prominent than virtues. The impression produced on me by a long study of those times, hardly to be verified by direct quotations, but by stray inferences and by reasoning back from the evidence of later writers, is that private life and manners were both purer and more refined than they had been in the great days of Greece. Slavery had certainly become milder, and manumissions more frequent. National exclusiveness had received its death-blow, by the widening of parochial into imperial and transmarine policy. Religion in the proper sense was far more diffused. For if men were now very sceptical as to the traditional myths and creeds, they were far more serious as to the duties of life. The Stoic and Cynic philosophers afforded them an itinerant clergy, which contrasted strangely with the established priests, whose offices were rich sinecures, often held by professed unbelievers.[1] And if the separation of society into clergy and laity, into the serious and the worldly, has its bad side, nevertheless the very setting up of a higher standard of life is of no little service. Even the people that only pretend to it increase its influence as a fashion, and many weak and neutral characters drift into virtue with the current of the day.

[1] Cf. the case of Pyrrho, a complete sceptic, being made a *high-priest* at Elis in Diog. Laert. ix. 11, § 64.

The same thing may be said of the amenities of life. If people were still zealous in adorning their cities with statues and public buildings, we may be certain that much more care was bestowed on the interior of private houses, and that pictures, precious ware, and plate were not only more elegant but far more widely used. The very frequency and pertinacity with which the enemy destroyed works of art in an invasion, together with the loud complaints that it was a gross violation of the laws of honourable warfare, shows what value men put on these refinements of life.

Literary taste indeed had by no means sustained itself in the same way. With the exception of Homer, who stood alone and apart as a sort of Bible, which even serious philosophers read night and morning for their moral instruction,[1] we must admit that the sense of literary perfection was not vouchsafed to this generation. They had in their Athenian, Pergamene, and Alexandrian authors, love poems, novels, controversial tracts, the history of cooking, and still more the cooking of history by compilers and partisans, and thought the rhetoric of Rhodes and Tarsus better than the grace of Plato or the force of Demosthenes.

In no respect do I feel this decadence so strongly as in the disappearance of both wit and humour from the literature of this age. We have indeed only remnants of what was then written; but it is no accident that in the whole of Alexandrian literature there is hardly a trace of humour,[2] and no better wit than the smartness of occasional epigrams. This is a very striking gap in the Hellenistic intellect, all

[1] Cf. Diog. Laert. iv. 6, 8, on Arcesilaus: 'He most admired Homer, of whom he always read something when going to bed; also in the morning, saying he was going to see his beloved, when he desired to read him.'

[2] Cf. a solitary exception in Callimachus's *Hymn to Demeter* (vi.) on Erysichthon and his hunger, Appendix F.

the more striking as the modern Greek, so intellectual and so enterprising, is equally devoid of this precious salt of human conversation. From Alexander's day to the present, the descendants of Cratinus and Aristophanes have bid farewell to wit, those of Plato to humour. The one great exception, Lucian, comes from beyond the bounds, both in space and time, of Hellenistic life. Such men as Dio and Plutarch cannot even understand or appreciate the brilliancy of the Old Comedy, they set it aside as coarse and vulgar beside the quiet humour of Menander, which they probably misunderstood, taking as serious his social banter. No literature, however, can be great without this delicate touchstone, which exhibits every fault of tediousness, of excess, of stupidity, of cleverness, of pedantry, of ignorance, not only in others but in ourselves, and saves us from the follies of enthusiasm, of pomp, and of ostentation.

Its decay in the Hellenistic age was the surest sign of the decay of the high standard of taste which has made Attic literature the model for every age. No writer is so likely to become ridiculous as he that has no appreciation of the ridiculous; such a work as the *Alexandra* of Lycophron would not have survived the censure of the Attic Comedy for a day.

The causes of this decadence in humour are very obscure. The only obvious one is in itself quite inadequate to explain the facts. When the Greeks fell under the sway of the Romans, they were obliged to serve and please patrons singularly wanting in this quality. But to such masters nothing is so disagreeable and suspicious as the presence of it in their servants. The pompous upstart fears nothing so much as the silent twinkle in the obedient slave's eye, which implies that he is taking the measure of his lord's intellect. Thus the habit of serving for generations

is likely to make men feel that humour is a dangerous gift of the gods, and one likely to prove an obstacle to advancement in the world. But this is only touching the outskirt of a very curious subject, to which I hope, some day, to return.

The other signs of better civilisation were, therefore, not accompanied by any remarkable development of literature. Apollonius Rhodius, the last survivor of the Alexandrian golden age, died an old man in 188 B.C. Aristophanes of Byzantium, the first great man of the new critical school, was rising into note. Eratosthenes and Archimedes, the most splendid representatives of Alexandrian science, were now advanced in age or dead, and left no worthy successors. The poets of the new tragedies and comedies performed by strolling companies, the writers of smart epigrams, the second-rate pamphlets of later philosophers—all this is not of any note or worthy of any close inquiry. But we may observe the increasing habit of making known opinions and carrying on controversies by public letters rather than by real discussion. Aratus's *Memoirs* were plainly an *apologia pro vita sua*; another case of these controversial documents is where he and Cleomenes were struggling for supremacy, and he foiled Cleomenes in his attempt to meet the Achaeans at Argos. Then Cleomenes responded by an open letter accusing Aratus of cowardice and treachery, to which Aratus replied, and they even condescended, says Plutarch, to attack one another's private life, relations with women, and the like. It is probably from this date therefore that the habit of collecting or copying the letters of famous men came into fashion. The body of these handed down to us is mostly spurious, and composed by rhetoricians and sophists on the model of what might or ought to have been said, but the prevalence of such forgeries points to genuine

documents having existed, and being sought after by the public.

Yet if they had lost the inestimable education of the great masters, they had certainly gained—what is generally more effective in society—the habits and thoughts of travelled men. Many in every city had seen Antioch and Alexandria, had made campaigns into Asia, or endured slavery in Rome or Carthage, and had returned with experiences far wider than could fall to the lot of the Periclean Athenian. Quite apart from the 'braggart captain' that appeared in the later comedies, there must have been many really educated by these military services, just as Descartes and other men of his day sought foreign travel under the guise of mercenary service.[1] Hence the cultivated Greek of these later days differed from his far more highly trained and literary forefathers as a travelled man nowadays, a soldier or sailor, differs from the literary man of far greater attainments who has never left his provincial town. The former is far inferior in knowledge and in theoretical matters to the latter, but he is more agreeable, and has more manners and more tact, for he is a man of the world, and his experiences make up for his want of severe mental training.

And yet the gain was not all upon the surface. For we must respect the society which let the New Comedy die out, because it preferred the lectures of the philosophers. Nevertheless we cannot but see such symptoms of decay as would certainly have led to some great gradual change had not the Roman conquest supervened. The constant political frays, which could never be allayed save by the military force of a stronger power from without; the unequal distribution of wealth, which produced an angry and dangerous proletariat; and, worse than all, the rapid diminution of population in

[1] Cf. my *Life of Descartes* (Blackwood, 1881).

Greece and Macedonia, are clear and painful evidences of this decay. Asia Minor, on the contrary, which had long abandoned all idea of liberties beyond those of internal order and police in the cities, was in a prosperous condition, and full of wealth and energy.[1]

What might have happened is, however, of no account; what did happen was a terrible and ruinous conquest.

[1] The education of the cities of Asia Minor in submission to a superior authority began when Mardonius inaugurated his original policy of abolishing tyrants in the Ionic cities, and substituting democracies, of course under the general control of the satrap of Asia Minor. The hereditary dynasts, such as Lygdamis or Maussollus, who afterwards arose, assumed the position of the satrap, and were a power controlling the βουλή and δῆμος of their city, but altogether outside the constitution. Hence these names come in quite a casual way in various decrees of the civic authorities, often as external benefactors to the city. This curious compromise between autonomy and despotism became a traditional anomaly, and thus only can we explain the form of various decrees now recovered from Pergamum under its kings. For these kings, beginning their rule as satraps of Seleucus or Antiochus (after Lysimachus was dead), fell into the habits of the country, and swayed Pergamum, though unrecognised in its free constitution. These curious facts, which I shall discuss more fully elsewhere, show how under the Roman sway the Asiatic cities did not feel any new and unwonted control, such as that so keenly felt by the cities of Greece.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE IMPORTATION OF HELLENISM TO ROME

WHATEVER may have been the misfortunes which befel the islanders and the kingdom of Pergamum as consequences of Roman dominion, there was one feature absent—that wholesale deportation or enslavement of the better classes which ruined for ever the future of Macedonia, Epirus, and Greece. The 1000 exiles, of whom Polybius was one, left all the management of their respective cities to far inferior men; and when, after their weary captivity of seventeen years, the remainder came home embittered by despair and deteriorated by burning resentment, they found the whole condition of the Peloponnesus altered, and most of that moderation and reticence which marks men of breeding and culture gone for ever.

Far worse was the case of Macedonia, where every man of mark, every noble, every official, was deported, so that the whole country was deprived of its upper classes and therefore of all its culture. For here it was only the dominant caste that had attained culture; the soldier-peasants were no better than they now are—shepherds and clephts. But worst of all was the fate of Epirus, where 150,000 people were literally sold into slavery, and the country so depopulated that by and by Augustus had to sweep a whole

district of its inhabitants to make his one new town, Nicopolis. Even when population is increasing, and society is young and vigorous, such dreadful calamities may be irremediable, but in the decaying days of an old culture, which wanted new blood and new stimulus to keep it from decrepitude, they were absolutely ruinous. From 146 B.C. the Hellenic peninsula almost disappears from history, except as the accidental theatre of those terrible Roman campaigns in the Civil Wars, which must have drained the last life-drops of remaining prosperity by their requisitions and exactions.

Greek Hellenism did not submit to these cruelties without fierce death-struggles. The Romanised Polybius, or at least Polybius in the history he composed for Roman readers, wonders at the heaven-sent madness of the Macedonians, who, after they had received 'their liberty,' and their taxes were reduced to half the amount they had paid their kings, yet rose in constant insurrections,[1] and joined the standard of any pretender to the royal blood who promised to rescue them from their new and precious privileges! There is no judgment in the historian more monstrous. A people of old feudal and monarchical habits had their royal family abolished, their nobility destroyed, all the tokens of their ancient splendour carried away as spoil, and were given a brand-new democratical code by the victors as an ample substitute![2] And this was called *liberty*, when the country was divided into four sections, and all intercourse strictly forbidden between them! What family ties must have been broken, even among those who had not been deported, what trade relations ruined among all those whose

[1] Cf. the parallel case of the Aetolians cited above, p. 484.

[2] Thus, at a later date, the Cappadocians, when their royal family died out (about 93 B.C.), absolutely refused the *liberty* offered them by the Romans, and demanded a king (Strabo xii. 2, § 11).

business was more than parochial! How intolerable to old friends and connexions through Macedonia to find all intercourse interdicted, and their noble fatherland cut into sections by new and artificial boundaries! And presently they found Roman merchants going freely to and fro and monopolising by this privilege even the real home trade of their country, which the new laws had rendered impossible to native enterprise. Their false Philips, their bloody insurrections were, therefore, only the agony of a noble nationality, which if conquered was not subdued, and which passed away for ever with rage in its heart and curses upon its tongue.

The fate of Greece was far less tragic, and yet Polybius, whose judgment is here very different, rises to eloquence in describing the national terror and despair when the last great blow was seen coming upon his country. He says [1] that when Critolaus was dead, and the law required the previous Commander of the League to resume office, pending a new election, Diaeus, the most violent of the so-called nationalist party, came back to power. He immediately made great requisitions of men, not only free, but home-born slaves, whom he ordered to be liberated and armed. All this was done capriciously, and without just allotment as regarded the wealth or resources of individuals. He made all pay heavy taxes, and commanded a general levy to meet at Corinth. 'From these causes all the cities were filled with perplexity, confusion, and dismay. And men praised the lot of those that were dead, but pitied those who were setting out (for Corinth), and all lamented them, foreseeing the end; and they were troubled by the insolence and the laziness of their servants, some of whom were just freed, and others set up by this hope. Together with this

[1] xxxix. 8.

men were obliged to contribute out of proportion to their means, and women, deprived of their own and their children's ornaments, paid them in taxes as it were deliberately for their own destruction.

'But all these things, coming upon them together, distracted by their separate griefs the attention of men from the general consideration that they were all being brought to manifest destruction, with their wives and children. So, as it were, carried along by the violence of some mountain torrent, they obeyed the folly and infatuation of their leader. The Eleans and Messenians indeed remained at home, expecting the advent on their coasts of the Roman fleet; but nothing would have saved them, had it appeared according to the original plan. The people of Patrae had already been among those defeated in Phocis (by Metellus), and their condition was even worse than the rest. For some desperately resigned their own lives, and others fled out into the country at random, with no definite aim, on account of the terror pervading the towns. And there were some who handed up their neighbours to the enemy as being hostile to Roman interests, and some who accused and informed against their neighbours, when nobody asked or wanted them to do it. Others went out as suppliants, confessing that they had violated the treaty, and asking what they must suffer, when no inquiry of the kind was being instituted by any one. And everywhere there prevailed a strange epidemic of men throwing themselves from cliffs or into tanks, so that even an enemy who beheld it would have pitied the agony of Greece.'

Let me add that the Romans carried away not only the nobility, but the very traditions of the people they conquered. This feature in Roman conquests had already been noticed in the case of Syracuse, from which every public ornament

was carried away by deliberate public command to Rome, and Polybius [1] censures this idle and mischievous rapacity, which perpetuated the hatred of the vanquished, in terms as severe as he ventured to use when writing under the eye of his Roman patrons. The conquered cities were deprived of their gods, their heroes, the splendid works and generosities of their forefathers, the monuments which gave them a position in the world and a reputation among men.[2]

And what did the Romans gain by all the civilised crowds of men, whom they deported with statues, pictures, and treasure to Rome?

The first thing that strikes us when we hear of the whole nobility of Macedonia, and then of Achaea, being scattered through Italy, is that this large though compulsory immigration ought to have had an important influence on Italian life.[3] And yet, except in the solitary instance of Polybius, not one word transpires to tell us that such was the case. We do not hear of a single remarkable man descended from this foreign blood, and tracing his origin to Macedonian or Greek nobility. We do not hear of any country town which was humanised by these noble exiles, or which benefited by their culture. What on earth became of them all? The son of King Perseus was a petty clerk in a country town, and so earned a miserable livelihood. Though the terrible invasion of Hannibal had depopulated vast tracts of Italy, which

[1] ix. 10. The Syracusans recovered a great deal from Carthage in 146 B.C. Cf. Diodorus p. 591. Cicero *Verr.* II. iv. 54 makes some qualifications of the statement in the text. Another case in point is Ambracia, on which see Livy xxxviii. 9, and xlv. 28; also Cic. *Verr.* II. iv. 59 and 60.

[2] The case of the vanquished is pathetically put by Livy xxxviii. 43. Cf. the text given in Overbeck *GP.* ii. 302.

[3] So Zeller says, *Gesch. der griech. Philosophie* iii. 1, p. 532, without evidence.

urgently demanded new population, no attempt was made to gather these educated exiles into new centres of cultivation as well as culture. When Tiberius Gracchus travelled through Italy a dozen years after the fall of Corinth, he finds the *latifundia* invading all the country—herdsmen who were slaves, pasture, but no free population. The captives were not allowed to settle in the cities of Magna Graecia, where they might have found a home, but in those of Etruria and Umbria, where the populace could not understand them, and where they died out gradually as isolated and broken-hearted strangers. This it was which filled with such rage the hearts of the 300 Achaeans who returned after seventeen years of internation in Italy, that they could think of nothing but impotent revenge. Moreover, if many Greeks were now slaves in Italy, many Italians had long been slaves in Greece, and the 1200 liberated by the Achaean League in compliment to Flamininus were only a small remnant, like the 300 Achaeans who came home from Italy. Yet all these contacts produced no national approximation. For there was deep antipathy between the Romans and the Greeks, an antipathy based upon strong contrasts of character, and contempt felt by each for the faults of the other—want of intelligence in the Roman, want of rectitude in the Greek.

If then Hellenistic men were such complete foreigners in Italy, we may be sure that the art treasures which they valued, and which represented Greek civilisation, were not much better understood.

Polybius, when describing the sack of Corinth (146 B.C.), which he had witnessed, speaks with sadness of the reckless destruction of precious works of art and historic monuments. He says he saw pictures thrown upon the ground, and soldiers using them for diceboards. He mentions specially Aristeides's picture of Dionysus, and Hercules writhing in

the tunic of Dejanira.[1] Such things are all the more remarkable when we consider that the Roman armies had already some training in Hellenistic campaigns, and that the soldiers of that day were no longer honest yeomen, but a class which served for the deliberate purpose of gain and plunder. They had all seen or heard of the campaign of Magnesia, and again of the campaign of Pydna, when the wealth of Macedon had been exhibited at the triumph of Aem. Paullus, and even then (167 B.C.) there had been discontent to the verge of mutiny in the army, because the stern general had curtailed their share of the booty. It is perhaps unreasonable to expect from the mere soldiery of any age, even our own, an appreciation of art, but in the army of Mummius this barbarism reached as high as the officers, and even, it is said, the commander-in-chief.[2]

What the Roman better classes had been a few years before, when the treasures of Macedonia were brought home to them,[3] is told us in a passage of Polybius, as interesting perhaps as anything in the records of this time. 'L. Anicius,' says the excerpt, 'the Roman praetor, having conquered

[1] xxxviii. 13.

[2] The 37th oration ascribed to Dio Chrysostom says that Mummius, when he carried off Greek statues to Rome, did not know by what names to call them, and that he had Zeus inscribed on the statue of the Isthmian Poseidon, and Nestor and Priam on two statues of Arcadian youths from Pheneus. This at least shows in what estimation Mummius's artistic notions were held. The story of his requiring his contractors to replace any work of art lost or broken on the way to Rome is in the same vein.

[3] Pliny (xxxiv. 51) indeed speaks of the 156th Olympiad as the moment when Greek art received a new impulse from Rome, and it is known that Metellus Macedonicus was the first to employ a Greek architect of repute, Hermodorus, for his buildings. But the facts in the text show that Pliny's date is too early, though Brunn accepts it, and Overbeck consents (*Griech. Plastik* ii. 361, 372), as appears indeed from Overbeck himself, ii. 364, regarding the time when *private* thefts of art-treasures began.

the Illyrians, and bringing captive King Genthius with his children, did some funny things when celebrating his victory by public games and contests at Rome. For he engaged all the most famous artists to come from Greece, and having set up a vast stage in the circus, he first introduced all the flute-players together. They were Theodorus, Theopompus, Hermippus, etc., who were then very celebrated. Having put them on the proscenium with the chorus, he desired them all to blow away. But when they proceeded to go through their melody with the appropriate figures, he sent up to tell them they were not playing properly, and directed them to have more of a contest.[1] And as they were puzzled at this, one of the lictors showed them by gestures that they were to turn one against another, and, as it were, make a kind of fight of it. So the flautists promptly perceiving it, and taking up a tune appropriate to their own orgies, caused a tremendous confusion; and turning the middle against the ends of the chorus, and blowing at random so as to make discords, they led one side in turn against the other; and along with them the choristers with loud beating of feet, and shaking the stage, advanced against their opponents and retired in turn. But when one of the chorus tucked up his dress, and, suddenly turning round, raised his fists in a boxing attitude at the flute-player advancing against him, forthwith great applause and shouts of delight burst from the audience. And while they were still fighting their pitched battle, two dancers with musical accompaniments were brought into the orchestra (in front of the stage), and four boxers also ascended the stage with trumpeters and horn-blowers. When these all went on together, the result was indescribable. I suppose people will think I am joking

[1] The man probably thought that ἀγών meant a conflict only, and not a competition of artists.

in what I am going to add about the performance of the tragedies.' And here the wretched excerptor breaks off the text.[1]

Such were the people who had been listening to Plautus for at least a generation, and for whom various attempts had been made by clever Latin poets to introduce the beauties of Greek literature in translations! Yet the complaints of Terence as to his *Hecyra*, which the whole public deserted to attend a bear-fight, seem to show that not even the teaching of this very polished adapter of Greek plays, whose Latin attains classical elegance, had any large effect. There was, of course, what Mommsen calls the Scipionic circle, a small set of enlightened men standing aloof from, and despising, the masses, to whom both Polybius and Terence were attached, and who attained a great deal of Hellenistic polish without losing all the braver qualities of Roman nobles. It is for these men that Polybius feels such reverence, and whom he contrasts so broadly with his own nation.

But the Roman was always very strange to him, and with very much the strangeness which an Irishman feels in the Englishman, however oft and long he may sojourn in England. 'A Roman lady who drinks wine (which was forbidden) cannot escape notice, for it is her habit to kiss all her own and her husband's relatives, as far as first cousins, whenever she first meets them in the day.'[2] At the same time, the state of a great Roman lady, which he describes in connexion with Scipio Aemilianus's generosities,[3] was quite above that of any Greek woman, even of many Hellenistic queens.

[1] xxx. 14. Pliny (xxxv. 11) mentions that Paullus asked the Athenians for a philosopher and a painter, and they sent him one called Metrodorus to serve for both. Cf. Clinton *Fasti* iii. p. 537.

[2] vi. 2. [3] xxxii. 12.

But this very passage shows us that generosity of character, especially as to money, was almost unknown at Rome, and that to pay a debt one day sooner than the fixed day, or to give one farthing as a gift, was quite unheard of. This is of a piece with the coarseness and brutality of their warfare. They were not cruel perhaps in the sense that the Greeks were, but brutal in massacring, and selling into slavery ruthlessly, without admitting the custom of ransom received all through Hellenism. Even captive kings were, as a rule, starved to death or executed as malefactors.

Nevertheless there was a great regularity and method in all their life, in which lay the secret of their superiority to the Greeks. Whether it was the regulating of an army, with its camp, its discipline, and its entrenchments, or the herding of swine, which was also done on an immense scale to the sound of trumpets,[1] which these beasts were taught to obey, there was order and system in Roman life. And until Greek license came in, which Polybius sees already depraving the conquerors, the incorruptibility of Roman nobles was quite signal in comparison with the conduct of Greeks. I have already quoted a passage where this is stated, but there is much additional evidence. Antiochus the Great offered Scipio Africanus large moneys to make him a favourable peace just before the battle of Magnesia, which were contemptuously set aside, though, by the way, the second Scipio, who was then actually commanding the army, was not above suspicion. So the Aetolians went about charging T. Flamininus with being bribed by Philip to give him easy terms after Cynoscephalae; but nobody would believe them.[2] Yet Flamininus, too, had a brother of singular worthlessness.

[1] xii. 3, xviii. 18.

[2] Cf. xix. 35. 'I, as regards earlier times, and making a general

Thus we see how the Roman virtues, based rather upon tradition than the result of rational thinking, and exercised in great public duties, were rapidly being invaded by the intellectual vices which came in from the East. In the very house with the true noble were the coarse debauchee and the contemptible snob.[1] Polybius tells us of a certain Aulus Postumius Albinus, of the highest family, but by nature a babbler and very vain, who, being enamoured of Greek culture and letters, spent all his time at them, so that he afforded an argument to the conservative elders at Rome against this culture; he wrote in Latin a book *de adventu Aeneae*, evidently to prove the Hellenic origin of the Romans, and at last he undertook to write a poem and a political history in Greek, in the preface of which latter he apologised for being unable, as a Roman, to master the niceties of the Greek language and its style. For this he was of course ridiculed, as nobody had urged him to undertake the task. The rest of his life, says Polybius, exhibited the worst points of Greeks, viz. love of pleasure and avoidance of work, for being in Phocis at the commencement of the campaign of Metellus, who commanded till Mummius arrived, he retired, pretending illness, to Thebes to avoid the danger; but when the battle of Scarpheia was over, he was the first to announce to the senate the victory, giving details as if he had himself taken a part in the fight.[2] This

statement, made bold to say of all the Romans that they would do no such thing—I mean before they entered upon their transmarine wars, and still abode by their old national customs and habits. At the present time I should not venture to make the statement absolutely, but I would undertake to prove, in the majority of cases, that Romans can preserve their honour under such circumstances.'

[1] On the brutal and cynical side of the Roman nobility cf. above, p. 478; cf. also Appian *Mith.* 56.

[2] xxxviii. 12. The Hellenistic counterpart of this person was the Epirot Charops, who came as a young man to Rome to learn the Latin

sort of person was pandered to by a perfect invasion of Greeks; as Polybius observed to Scipio: 'If you want instruction, you have no lack of teachers to help you, for I see a whole tribe of such people pouring in from Greece.'[1]

Hence a great and sudden collapse of the Roman character, especially after the complete success of the last Macedonian war. Every kind of luxury and vice was cultivated with extravagant cost; a minion or a mistress cost a talent; and with no fear of any rival in power, the Romans adopted all the materials of refinement wholesale from Macedonia, though they lacked intellectual training to resist its seductive influences.

Much of the blame must be laid upon the senate, which never devised any rational means of governing its transmarine subjects, or dealing with transmarine diplomacy. It started with trusting almost absolutely some one man like T. Flamininus, who happened to have Greek training, and who did almost what he liked in the East. When the mistakes of individual statesmen grew apparent, there arose the era of Commissions, which must have been very delightful to Roman nobles, who went about like kings at public cost, and enjoyed all the pleasures of Hellenistic life, but brought home partial or superficial reports. It was as if we were now to govern Ireland by the reports of commissioners, or of tourists who come over to inquire into each quarrel, without keeping a government office and permanent officials to deal regularly with the course of affairs. We cannot find that the Romans ever devised any system of residents at foreign courts, like those we now keep at the courts of

tongue and letters (xxvii. 15), but who turned out a terrible scourge to his country from his wickedness, combined with the influence he obtained at Rome.

[1] *πολὺ γὰρ δή τι φῦλον ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπιρρέον ὁρῶ κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων* xxxii. 10.

Indian kings, or of ambassadors, whom the senate could trust both from their position as great patricians, and from their experience as long residents in the country.[1] For what can tourist commissioners ever find out accurately, especially from a population admirably suited and very eager to deceive them?

Alternating with these Roman commissions abroad, was the stream of Hellenistic embassies to Rome, not to speak of princes and politicians who went on embassies for themselves, to gain favour and power by means of private friendships with great houses at Rome. There is evidence of this at every turn in the generation now before us. For example,[2] when it was known that the senate would receive charges against Philip V., a whole series of people came to make complaints both for cities and privately. Polybius enumerates them all, and says that the senate was completely puzzled with the complexity of their evidence. The king's side was represented by his son Demetrius, to whom the senate was very favourable, with that nefarious policy which sought to raise up enemies and rivals to every Hellenistic sovran within his own house.

Nothing can, indeed, be more pitiable and disgraceful

[1] Thus Polybius says (xxxii. 28), when relating the quarrel between Prusias and Attalus, that 'the people in Rome paid no attention (οὐ προσεῖχον) to the statement made to the senate by Andronicus, but suspected (ὑπενόουν) that Attalus was substantially the aggressor, and when ambassadors from the other side came, distrusted (ἠπίστει) even more what had been said. By and by the senate in perplexity about the matter (ἀμφιδοξήσασα) sent out commissioners to inquire' (cf. also xxxii. 21).

Achaeus, on the contrary, a new sovran in Asia Minor, had three accredited agents in Rhodes and Ephesus (viii. 18). There was such a demand for Roman commissioners that, on one occasion at least, three men were sent to the East, who were a public laughing-stock. Appian *Mith.* 6 seems to think the senate chose these persons intentionally.

[2] xxiii. 1.

than the Roman policy to Greece and the East during this crisis. As I have already described it, I will only here add a sentence from Polybius. 'Though often professing inability to decide, and declaring that they would no longer interfere, they showed plainly in many instances that, far from desiring to get rid of such foreign questions as were not pressing, they were much offended if everything in their allied Greek states was not referred to them and done with their approval;'[1] and this obsequiousness was distinctly the policy of the Roman party in the Achaean League, as opposed to the patriots.[2]

It is needless to insist upon the sort of ambassador who was most likely to succeed under such circumstances. There is evidence through Polybius that the answers of the senate were not properly recorded or published, so that the envoys could report with modifications, or the senate give a fresh answer contradicting the former without being exposed.[3] Here again the want of foreign representatives was an incurable defect. So the people succeeded who were like Deinocrates the Messenian—*αὐλικὸς καὶ στρατιωτικός, ἦν δὲ ψευδεπίγραφος καὶ ῥωπικός*, to use the curious words of Polybius. Even the three philosophers sent by Athens, who made such a sensation at Rome, did so by their deliberate display of eloquence and of learning, which, indeed, cannot have been understood by many who pretended to do so, as their business in the senate was done through an interpreter, C. Acilius.[4]

It is clear enough that by this time the Greeks at Rome,

[1] xxiii. 17. [2] xxiv. 11.

[3] For evidence of this very strange want of written and published records cf. xxxii. 21, when Charops, being snubbed at Rome, suppressed the answer he got from the senate, and invented quite a different one to tell at home.

[4] Aul. Gellius *Noct. Att.* vi. (vii.) 14.

οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες, were quite a colony, in the sense that we now speak of the English *colony* at Naples or Florence. They were a public in themselves, with an opinion of their own, which was clearly expressed. This Greek public opinion at Rome is often alluded to by Polybius. It must have been a fashionable society too, for at the head of it were always a number of Hellenistic princes, to whom I have often referred as being the instructors or depravers of the aristocratic Roman youth. Thus Demetrius, who had been from childhood a hostage in Rome, when Antiochus Epiphanes died, desired eagerly to be restored to his home, and claimed the kingdom from the senate.[1] He urged his case in that he regarded Rome hitherto as his real home and nurse, and that the sons of the senators stood to him *in the relation of brothers, but they themselves of fathers.* When the senate saw his ability and vigour, they declined his suit, thinking it better to give the kingdom of Syria to a weak child, with Demetrius to be utilised in case national opposition arose. The result was that Demetrius took the matter into his own hands, and escaped to win his kingdom for himself. The narrative is so characteristic that I give it here in detail.

So Demetrius having in vain sung his song of despair before the senate, turned back to the advice Polybius had given him, not to stumble twice over the same stone, and consulted his old tutor Diodorus, who had just come from Syria. The latter assured him that everything was ripe for a change, and that if he suddenly appeared with a single slave in attendance, he would probably gain the sovranty without active interference of the senate. But the starting-point was to escape from Rome unobserved, and without his design being suspected. So Demetrius sent for Polybius, and having explained to him his whole plan asked him to assist in it, and help him in planning his escape.

[1] xxxi. 12.

Now it happened that there was in Rome at the time a certain Menyllus of Alabanda, ambassador from the elder Ptolemy (Philometor) for the discussions with the younger (Physcon), with whom Polybius was very intimate, and in whom he trusted thoroughly, so thinking him a suitable instrument he introduced him with the strongest recommendations to Demetrius. Accordingly Menyllus undertook to make ready the ship and other necessaries for the voyage, and finding at the mouth of the Tiber a Carthaginian ship which had come on some religious service, chartered it. It happens that these vessels are specially selected from Carthage, in which the Carthaginians send to Tyre the traditional first-fruits for the gods. He therefore chartered it openly for his own return passage, so that he made arrangements for provisioning it without suspicion, and openly spoke and bargained with the sailors. So when the skipper had all ready, and it only remained for Demetrius to accomplish his part, he sent off his tutor to Syria to gather news and feel the pulse of the population. But his companion from youth, Apollonius, was privy to the plot, and communicated it to two brothers, Meleager and Menestheus, and to none of the rest of their many intimates. These were sons of a high Syrian officer who had been dismissed by Antiochus Epiphanes. When the appointed day came, it was necessary to manage a reception at the house of a friend, for Demetrius could not dine at home, seeing that he was particular in inviting all his household to dine with him. Those who were privy were to come from home after dinner with one slave each to the ship, for the rest they had sent on to Anagnia, intending to follow them next day. Now Polybius was at the time sick and in bed, but was kept informed by Menyllus of everything; and feeling very anxious lest if the dinner was protracted, as Demetrius was naturally convivial and a mere boy in disposition, some hitch should occur in their departure through drunkenness, he wrote on a small tablet, and having sealed it, sent it by his slave as it was growing dusk, with orders to call out the cupbearer of Demetrius and give it to him, without telling who he was or whence he came, with orders to let Demetrius read it at once. The tablet contained the following maxims [culled from Greek comedies]:—

'The Doer from the Dallier takes the prize.'

'The night is fair, but fairer to the bold.'
'Do, dare, encounter danger and defeat,
but forfeit not, O fortunate, thyself.'
'Be sober and cherish mistrust; these are the thews of the mind.'

As soon as Demetrius had read this and perceived whence it came, he affected sickness and took his leave, accompanied by his friends; and when he reached his lodging (at Rome) he sent such of his servants as were in the way to Anagnia, ordering them to meet him with hunting nets and dogs at Circeii, for he used constantly to hunt the wild boar, which indeed was the origin of his intimacy with Polybius. He then disclosed his plot to Nicanor's party, and called upon them to help him. And when they all agreed, he told them each to hurry home and direct their slaves to precede them before dawn to Anagnia, and meet them with the huntsmen at Circeii, but to put on travelling dress themselves and come back to him, telling the servants that they would meet them next day with Demetrius at the appointed place. All this being done, they went off by night to Ostia at the mouth of the Tiber. Meanwhile Menyllus had gone before them, and had a talk with the sailors, saying something had reached him from the king (of Egypt) which necessarily detained him in Rome for the present, but that he would still send some of the trustiest youths about him, from whom the king would learn all about the claims of his brother. So he said he would not embark himself, but that the others would come about midnight. It was all the same to the skipper, as the sum agreed upon was not altered, and they were now ready for some time; so at the end of the third watch the party came, eight in number, with five slaves and three boys. So when Menyllus had given full instructions, and showed them their provisions, the captain set sail at dawn, with no suspicion that he was bringing anybody with him but some soldiers from Menyllus to Ptolemy.

It was four days before the absence of Demetrius was explained, and on the fifth, when the senate was hastily summoned, he was already past the Sicilian straits with a favouring wind.

This Demetrius was a good specimen of that class, considerable in its importance if not in its numbers, which was trained at Rome to support Roman policy and Roman interests in the East. Whether rightful heirs to their respective thrones, or doubtful claimants, kept for an awkward moment and let loose by the senate to disturb the peace and growth of any kingdom which seemed likely to assert itself, they were all taught to depend on the Republic, and to screen their vices and their crimes by influence at the centre of affairs. What the effect must have been on the decaying fragments of Alexander's empire was only too obvious. On the other hand we have the baser sort of Greeks influencing their Roman masters at first from beneath as servants, tutors, artists; and also in many illegitimate and vicious ways. Thus the first marriage of Greek civilisation with Roman life was disastrous enough, and it was long before it produced a healthy offspring. In literature Terence was perhaps the first hopeful specimen of what Latin could do in imitating the great models of Hellenism, and yet in Terence it is only graceful form which is attained; there is hardly a single great or noble idea. But here we must break off and relegate the growth of better things, of the spiritual Hellenism of later days, to another season.

I cannot conclude better than by calling the reader's attention to the prominence in that day of a great problem which is still awaiting its solution in many parts of the world—the problem of the relative claims of imperialism and of nationality to dominate among men. With the rise of Alexander's empire a great blow was struck in favour of imperialism. Whatever national distinctions remained, the Egyptian, the Syrian, the Phrygian, the Bithynian, felt the glamour of Hellenism, and sought to belong to the great Greek empire of language and of

culture. Until the Parthians and the Jews asserted themselves against the Seleucids, we hardly hear of any assertion of separate nationalities to separate rights, and the cultivation of a separate language or an exclusive religion was regarded as mere backwardness in civilisation. We have seen too, even in the case of the Jews, how nearly that tough and implacable nation had lost themselves in Hellenism, and how it was rather the accidents than the natural march of history which forced on the reaction.

So far then imperialism seemed not only to be coming into fashion, but even imperialism of a fixed type; and the world seemed to have gained greatly by it. But it was imperialism within moderate limits. The large number of kingdoms produced many capitals, and so while there was undoubtedly centralisation and bureaucracy, with a complete control of most things from each capital, there were not only innumerable 'Greek' towns with city-liberties, but the court and its officers were not too remote from their subjects of various creeds and languages, so that these latter could make themselves felt. Whatever losses and hardships may have been inflicted on Syrians and Egyptians by the establishment of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires, no one will contend that it would have been better for those nationalities had they followed an isolated path, and had Greek energy and culture not come to the aid of decaying Semite and Hamite life. Centralisation under a foreign nationality brought them new life even in their non-Hellenic aspects, for had there been no Ptolemies there would not have been a tithe of the splendid temples—Egyptian temples—which still tell us of the spirit of old Egyptian culture. Had there been no Antioch and Alexandria, Jewish literature would have died out into Talmud and Pirke-aboth, and none of the long series of Hellenistic books would have seen the light which reach

in an unbroken series down to the Gospel of St. John. Let, therefore, separate nationalities subordinate themselves, we might say, to great Hellenistic kingdoms, and seek their higher development not in narrow patriotism, not in the cultivation of nationality as an exclusive principle, but in the acceptance of cosmopolitan culture.

This has been exactly the solution reached in the modern divisions of Europe. It was undoubtedly better for all that the Breton, the Gascon, the Provençal, the Flamand, should unite under the sovranty of France, than that they should each insist on developing their separate nationalities. In the same way the Poles of Posen have been welded into Germany, and after long struggles have acquiesced in this decision. The case of England is quite similar; and as regards Italy, though it was rather separate political divisions than separate nations which were brought into the united kingdom, the contrasts in temper, tradition, and dialect between Piedmontese and Sicilian, Lombard and Calabrian, are quite deep enough to cause antipathies that may never disappear.

I have often repeated that the unity of Hellenism was similar to that of modern Europe, that as European culture means a definite thing, not possessed by Orientals or South Americans, so Hellenism had its own features, distinct from Italian and Eastern life. Within each of these unities then imperialism has prevailed, but with limited application.

It is but lately, within our own day in Europe, that England has led the way in an endeavour to reverse the decision of the last three centuries, first by her undisguised sympathies with Poles, Hungarians, Italians, who revolted from their sovrans on the ground of nationality, lately by permitting the public discussion of the dismemberment of her own empire into a federation upon the same ground. There

are signs therefore of a reaction against imperialism in the sense of direct control of separate nationalities from a single capital and by a single government. There is a curious sentiment growing, that no nation, or, indeed, collection of men, should be governed by another that speaks a different language, or professes a different religion, or even that does not command the sympathy of that nation.

This reaction too finds grounds of support in the history we have just considered. If the imperialism of Alexander, modified by his successors, did splendid service in stimulating the nations, and compelling them, as it were, to do their work by consultation, the imperialism of the Roman Republic which replaced it did hardly any good, and incalculable mischief. When modified and purified by Augustus and his successor, it produced certain material blessings—peace, good roads, good laws, and in the end contentment, but intellectually a terrible decay, and ultimately financial ruin. The touch of Rome numbed Greece and Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor, and if there are great buildings attesting the splendour of the empire, where are the signs of intellectual and moral vigour, if we except that stronghold of nationality, the little land of Palestine?

Here then it appears as if imperialism had been overdone, or applied in the wrong way, and that the living, various, complicated unity of Hellenistic imperialism had been succeeded by a hard, dead, unsympathetic power, which could not assimilate without crushing, or assist without patronising. Without going deep into the question, we may see that most of these evil results came from the ancient axiom in statesmanship, that the conquered were merely to live for the benefit of the conquerors, and that not only the nobles and merchants but the mob of Rome were to fatten and grow rich upon the provinces. If

England now administered her empire exclusively and confessedly for the enriching of nobles and merchants in London, and for the support in idleness of the London poor, we should have conditions approaching those of Rome and her subjects.

But I will not proceed further. This great and still-vexed problem is introduced to show the reader that in one more instance he may study the new in the old—modern theories in bygone examples. Polybius suggests that men would avoid being captured by the same stratagems, as is ever happening, if they read history and learned its lessons. He probably meant this for an advertisement of his own work. I am not so sanguine as to hope that my book will be of the same practical use, or that it will turn the 'most silly of animals' into something more sagacious. It is enough for me to hope that some current theories in politics and views of social life may be tested by the curious analogies of Hellenistic life, and that men will thus learn the living value of ancient history, if any history can be called ancient that deals with the ripe autumn of a full-grown civilisation.

APPENDIX A (Cf. p. 97)

Ithyphallic Song on King Demetrius (290 B.C.)

ὡς οἱ μέγιστοι τῶν θεῶν καὶ φίλτατοι
τῇ πόλει πάρεισιν.
ἐνταῦθα [γὰρ Δήμητρα καὶ] Δημήτριον
ἅμα παρῆγ' ὁ καιρός.
χὴ μὲν τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Κόρης μυστήρια
ἔρχεθ' ἵνα ποιήσῃ,
ὃ δ' ἱλαρός, ὥσπερ τὸν θεὸν δεῖ, καὶ καλὸς
καὶ γελῶν πάρεστι.
σεμνὸν ὅδε φαίνεθ', οἱ φίλοι πάντες κύκλῳ,
ἐν μέσοισι δ' αὐτός,
ὅμοιος ὥσπερ οἱ φίλοι μὲν ἀστέρες,
ἥλιος δ' ἐκεῖνος.
ὦ τοῦ κρατίστου παῖ Ποσειδῶνος θεοῦ
χαῖρε καὶ Ἀφροδίτης.
ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοί,
ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὦτα,
ἢ οὐκ εἰσίν, ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἕν·
σὲ δὲ παρόνθ' ὁρῶμεν,
οὐ ξύλινον οὐδὲ λίθινον ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν.
εὐχόμεσθα δή σοι·
πρῶτον μὲν εἰρήνην ποίησον φίλτατε·
κύριος γὰρ εἶ σύ.
τὴν δ' οὐχὶ Θηβῶν, ἀλλ' ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος
σφίγγα περικρατοῦσαν,
Αἰτωλόν, ὅστις ἐπὶ πέτρας καθήμενος
ὥσπερ ἡ παλαιὰ
τὰ σώματ' ἡμῶν πάντ' ἀναρπάσας φέρει,
κοὐκ ἔχω μάχεσθαι,
(αἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἁρπάσαι τὰ τῶν πέλας,
νῦν δὲ καὶ τὰ πόρρω)
μάλιστα μὲν δὴ κόλασον αὐτός· εἰ δὲ μή,
Οἰδίποιν τιν' εὑρέ,
τὴν σφίγγα ταύτην ὅστις ἢ κατακρημνιεῖ,
ἢ σπίλον ποιήσει.

APPENDIX B (Cf. p. 245)

From the *Diosemeia* of Aratus

σῆμα δέ τοι ἀνέμοιο καὶ οἰδάνουσα θάλασσα
γινέσθω, καὶ μακρὸν ἐπ' αἰγιαλοὶ βυόωντες,
ἀκταί τ' εἰνάλιοι ὁπότ' εὔδιοι ἠχήεσσαι
γίνονται, κορυφαί τε βωμέναι οὔρεος ἄκραι.
Καὶ δ' ἂν ἐπὶ ξηρὴν ὅτ' ἐρωδιὸς οὐ κατὰ κόσμον
ἐξ ἁλὸς ἔρχηται φωνῇ περίαλλα λεληκώς,
κινυμένου κε θάλασσαν ὕπερ φορέοιτ' ἀνέμοιο.
καί ποτε καὶ κέπφοι, ὁπότ' εὔδιοι ποτέονται,
ἀντία μελλόντων ἀνέμων εἰλῃδὰ φέρονται.
πολλάκι δ' ἀγριάδες νῆσσαι ἢ εἰναλίδιναι
αἴθυιαι χερσαῖα τινάσσονται πτερύγεσσιν·
ἢ νεφέλη ὄρεος μηκύνεται ἐν κορυφῇσιν.
ἤδη καὶ πάππoι, λευκῆς γήρειον ἀκάνθης
σῆμ' ἐγένοντ' ἀνέμοιο, κωφῆς ἁλὸς ὁππότε πολλοὶ
ἄκρον ἐπιπλείωσι, τὰ μὲν πάρος, ἄλλα δ' ὀπίσσω.
Καὶ θέρεος βρονταί τε καὶ ἀστραπαὶ ἔνθεν ἴωσιν,
ἔνθεν ἐπερχομένοιο περισκοπέειν ἀνέμοιο.
καὶ διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν ὅτ' ἀστέρες αἴσσωσιν
ταρφέα, τοὶ δ' ὄπιθεν ῥιμοὶ ὑπολευκαίνωνται,
ὀρθὸν ἔχθαι κείνοις αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἐρχομένοιο
πνεύματος· ἦν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐναντίοι ἀΐσσωσιν,
ἄλλοι δ' ἐξ ἄλλων μερέων, τότε δὴ πεφύλαξο
παντοίων ἀνέμων, οἵ τ' ἄκριτοί εἰσι μάλιστα,
ἄκριτα δὲ πνείουσιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι τεκμήρασθαι.
αὐτὰρ ὅτ' ἐξ εὔρου καὶ ἐκ νότου ἀστράπτῃσιν,
ἄλλοτε δ' ἐκ ζεφύροιο καὶ ἄλλοτε πὰρ βορέαο,
δὴ τότε τις πελάγει ἔνι δείδιε ναυτίλος ἀνὴρ
μή μιν τῇ μὲν ἔχῃ πέλαγος τῇ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ὕδωρ·
ὕδατι γὰρ τυσσαίδε περὶ στερόπαὶ φορέονται.
πολλάκι δ' ἐρχομένων ὑετῶν νέφεα προπάροιθεν
οἷα μάλιστα πόκοισιν ἐοικότες ἐνδιάλλονται·
ἢ διὸν μὴ ἔξωσε διὰ μέγαν οὐρανὸν Ἶρις·
ἢ καί πού τις ἄλωα μελαινομένην ἔχει ἀστήρ.

Virgil's Latin Adaptation

Continuo ventis surgentibus aut freta ponti
incipiunt agitata tumescere et aridus altis
montibus audiri fragor, aut resonantia longe
litora misceri et nemorum increbrescere murmur.
iam sibi tum curvis male temperat unda carinis,
cum medio celeres revolant ex aequore mergi
clamoremque ferunt ad litora, cumque marinae
in sicco ludunt fulicae, notasque paludes
deserit atque altam supra volat ardea nubem.
saepe etiam stellas vento impendente videbis
praecipites caelo labi, noctisque per umbram
flammarum longos a tergo albescere tractus;
saepe levem paleam et frondes volitare caducas,
aut summa nantes in aqua colludere plumas.
at Boreae de parte trucis cum fulminat, et cum
Eurique Zephyrique tonat domus, omnia plenis
rura natant fossis, atque omnis navita ponto
umida vela legit. numquam inprudentibus imber
obfuit: aut illum surgentem vallibus imis
aëriae fugere grues, aut bucula caelum
suspiciens patulis captavit naribus auras,
aut arguta lacus circumvolitavit hirundo
et veterem in limo ranae cecinere querellam.
saepius et tectis penetralibus extulit ova
angustum formica terens iter, et bibit ingens
arcus, et e pastu decedens agmine magno
corvorum increpuit densis exercitus alis.

Georgics i. 356-382.

APPENDIX C (Cf. p. 251)

Prologue to the *Phaenomena* of Aratus

Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν
ἄρρητον· μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί,
πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
καὶ λιμένες· πάντῃ δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν· ὁ δ' ἤπιος ἀνθρώποισιν
δεξιὰ σημαίνει, λαοὺς δ' ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει
μιμνήσκων βιότοιο· λέγει δ' ὅτε βῶλος ἀρίστη
βουσί τε καὶ μακέλῃσι, λέγει δ' ὅτε δεξιαὶ ὧραι
καὶ φυτὰ γυρῶσαι καὶ σπέρματα πάντα βαλέσθαι.
αὐτὸς γὰρ τάγε σήματ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξεν
ἄστρα διακρίνας· ἐσκέψατο δ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
ἀστέρας, οἵ κε μάλιστα τετυγμένα σημαίνοιεν
ἀνδράσιν ὡραίων, ὄφρ' ἔμπεδα πάντα φύωνται.
τῷ μιν ἀεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἱλάσκονται.
χαῖρε, πάτερ, μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειαρ
αὐτὸς καὶ προτέρη γενεή. χαίροιτε δὲ Μοῦσαι
μειλίχιαι μάλα πᾶσιν· ἐμοί γε μὲν ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν
ᾗ θέμις εὐχομένῳ τεκμήρατε πᾶσαν ἀοιδήν.

APPENDIX D (Cf. p. 261)

Fragment of Phanocles

Ἦ ὡς Οἰάγροιο πάϊς Θρηίκιος Ὀρφεὺς
ἐκ θυμοῦ Κάλαϊν στέρξε Βορηιάδην,
πολλάκι δὲ σκιεροῖσιν ἐν ἄλσεσιν ἕζετ' ἀείδων
ὃν πόθον, οὐδ' ἦν οἱ θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ,
ἀλλ' αἰεί μιν ἄγρυπνοι ὑπὸ ψυχῇ μελεδῶναι
ἔτρυχον, θαλερὸν δερκομένου Κάλαϊν.
τὸν μὲν Βιστονίδες κακομήχανοι ἀμφιχυθεῖσαι
ἔκτανον, εἰνάκη φάσγανα θηξάμεναι,

οὕνεκα πρῶτος δεῖξεν ἐνὶ Θρῄκεσσιν ἔρωτας
ἄρρενας, οὐδὲ πόθους ἤνεσε θηλυτέρων.
τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ μὲν κεφαλὴν χαλκῷ τάμον, αὐτίκα δ' αὐτὴν
εἰς ἅλα Θρηικίην ῥῖψαν ὁμοῦ χέλυϊ
ἤλῳ καρτύνασαι, ἵν' ἐμφορέοιντο θαλάσσῃ
ἄμφω ἅμα, γλαυκοῖς τεγγόμεναι ῥοθίοις.
τὰς δ' ἱερῇ Λέσβῳ πολιὴ ἐπέκελσε θάλασσα·
ἠχὴ δ' ὡς λιγυρῆς πάντον ἐπέσχε λύρης,
νήσους τ' αἰγιαλούς θ' ἁλιμυρέας, ἔνθα λίγειαν
ἀνέρες Ὀρφείην ἐκτέρισαν κεφαλήν.
ἐν δὲ χέλυν τύμβῳ λιγυρὴν θέσαν, ἣ καὶ ἀναύδους
πέτρας καὶ Φόρκου στυγιὸν ἔπειθεν ὕδωρ.
ἐκ κείνου μολπαί τε καὶ ἱμερτὴ κιθαριστὺς
νῆσον ἔχει, πασέων δ' ἐστὶν ἀοιδυτάτη.
Θρῆκες δ' ὡς ἐδάησαν ἀρήιοι ἔργα γυναικῶν
ἄγρια, καὶ πάντας δεινὸν ἐσῆλθεν ἄχος,
ἃς ἀλόχους ἔστιζον, ἵν' ἐν χροῒ σήματ' ἔχοισαι
κυάνεα στυγεροῦ μὴ λελάθοιντο φόνου.
ποιναὶς δ' Ὀρφῆι κταμένῳ στίζουσι γυναῖκας
εἰς ἔτι νῦν κείνης εἵνεκεν ἀμπλακίης.

The fragment would appear to us pathetic and beautiful, were we not all familiar with Virgil's far more pathetic and refined narrative in his fourth *Georgic*, where the digression is no doubt modelled closely upon those of the Alexandrian school, and the very legend copied from this and other like poets. But the touch of genius is there, and has transformed the baser metal of his models into pure gold. I give the passage here, that the reader may not have the trouble of seeking it among his books.

Ipse cava solans aegrum testudine amorem
te, dulcis coniunx, te solo in litore secum,
te veniente die, te decedente canebat.
Taenarias etiam fauces, alta ostia Ditis,
et caligantem nigra formidine lucum
ingressus Manesque adiit regemque tremendum
nesciaque humanis precibus mansuescere corda.
at cantu commotae Erebi de sedibus imis
umbrae ibant tenues simulacraque luce carentum.

quam multa in foliis avium se milia condunt,
vesper ubi aut hibernus agit de montibus imber,
matres atque viri defunctaque corpora vita
magnanimum heroum, pueri innuptaeque puellae,
impositique rogis iuvenes ante ora parentum ;
quos circum limus niger et deformis harundo
Cocyti tardaque palus inamabilis unda
adligat, et noviens Styx interfusa coërcet.
quin ipsae stupuere domus atque intima Leti
Tartara caeruleosque inplexae crinibus angues
Eumenides, tenuitque inhiantis tria Cerberus ora
atque Ixionii vento rota constitit orbis.
iamque pedem referens casus evaserat omnes
redditaque Eurydice superas veniebat ad auras
pone sequens—namque hanc dederat Proserpina legem
cum subita incautum dementia cepit amantem,
ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere Manes :
restitit, Eurydicenque suam iam luce sub ipsa
inmemor heu, victusque animi respexit. ibi omnis
effusus labor, atque inmitis rupta tyranni
foedera, terque fragor stagnis auditus Avernis.
illa 'quis et me,' inquit, 'miseram et te perdidit, Orpheu,
quis tantus furor? en iterum crudelia retro
fata vocant conditque natantia lumina somnus.
iamque vale : feror ingenti circumdata nocte
invalidasque tibi tendens, heu non tua, palmas!'
dixit, et ex oculis subito, ceu fumus in auras
commixtus tenuis, fugit diversa, neque illum
prensantem nequiquam umbras et multa volentem
dicere praeterea vidit, nec portitor Orci
amplius obiectam passus transire paludem.
quid faceret? quo se rapta bis coniuge ferret?
quo fletu Manes, qua numina voce moveret?
illa quidem Stygia nabat iam frigida cymba.
septem illum totos perhibent ex ordine menses
rupe sub aëria deserti ad Strymonis undam
flevisse et gelidis haec evolvisse sub antris,
mulcentem tigris et agentem carmine quercus ;
qualis populea maerens philomela sub umbra
amissos queritur fetus, quos durus arator
observans nido inplumes detraxit ; at illa
flet noctem, ramoque sedens miserabile carmen
integrat et maestis late loca questibus implet.
nulla Venus, non ulli animum flexere hymenaei.
solus Hyperboreas glacies Tanaimque nivalem
arvaque Rhipaeis numquam viduata pruinis
lustrabat, raptam Eurydicen atque inrita Ditis

dona querens ; spretae Ciconum quo munere matres
inter sacra deum nocturnique orgia Bacchi
discerptum latos iuvenem sparsere per agros.
tum quoque marmorea caput a cervice revulsum
gurgite cum medio portans Oeagrius Hebrus
volveret, Eurydicen vox ipsa et frigida lingua
a miseram Eurydicen ! anima fugiente vocabat ;
Eurydicen toto referebant flumine ripae.

APPENDIX E (Cf. p. 263)

The longest Fragment of Hermesianax

οἵην μὲν φίλος υἱὸς ἀνήγαγεν Οἰάγροιο
Ἀγριόπην θρῄσσαν στειλάμενος κιθάριν
ᾠδόθεν. ἔπλευσεν δὲ κακὸν καὶ ἀπεχθέα χῶρον,
ἔνθα Χάρων κυανὴν ἕλκεται εἰς ἄκατον
ψυχὰς οἰχομένων, λίμνῃ δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἀϋτεῖ
ῥεῦμα διὲκ μεγάλων συρομένῃ δονάκων.
ἀλλ' ἔτλη παρὰ κῦμα μονόζωστος κιθαρίζων
Ὀρφεύς, ἀνταίους δ' ἐξανέπεισε θεούς·
Κωκυτόν τ' ἀνέθιστον ἐπ' ὀφρύσιν οἰδήσαντα
εἶδε, καὶ αἰνοτάτου βλέμμ' ὑπέμεινε κυνός,
ἐν πυρὶ μὲν φωνὴν τεθωμένου ἐν πυρὶ δ' ὄμμα,
σκληρὸν τριστοίχοις θεῖμα φέρον κεφαλαῖς.
ἔνθεν ἀοιδιάων μεγάλους ἀνέπειρεν ἄνακτας
Ἀγριόπην μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα λαβεῖν βιότου.
οὐ μὴν οὐδ' υἱὸς Μήνης ἀγέραστον ἔθηκε
Μοισταῖος χαρίτων ἥρανος Ἀντιόπην,
ἥ τε πολὺν μύστρησιν Ἐλευσῖνος παρὰ πέξαν
εὐασμὸν κρυφίων ἐξεφόρει λογίων,
Ῥάριον ὀργειῶνι νόμῳ διαποιπνύουσα
Δήμητρι· γνωστὴ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδῃ.
φημὶ δὲ καὶ πατρῷον ἀποπρολιπόντα μέλαθρον
Ἡσίοδον, πάσης ἥρανον ἱστορίης,
Ἀσκραίων ἐσικέσθαι ἐρῶνθ' Ἑλικωνίδα κώμην·
ἔνθεν ὅ γ' Ἠοίην μνώμενος Ἀσκραϊκὴν

πόλλ' ἔπαθεν, πάσας δὲ λόγων ἀνεγράψατο βίβλους,
ὕμνων ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἐναρχόμενος.
αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος ἀοιδός, ὃν ἐκ Διὸς αἶσα φυλάσσει,
ᾔδει τὸν πάντων δαίμονα μοισοπόλων,
λεπτὴν δ' αἷς Ἰθάκην ἐνετείνετο θεῖος Ὅμηρος
ᾠδῇσιν πινυτῆς εἵνεκα Πηνελόπης,
ἣν διὰ πολλὰ παθὼν ὀλίγην ἐσενάσσατο νῆσον,
πολλὸν ἀπ' εὐρείης λειπόμενος πατρίδος·
ἔκλεε δ' Ἰκαρίου τε γένος καὶ δῆμον Ἀμύκλου
καὶ Σπάρτην, ἰδίων ἁπτόμενος παθέων
Μίμνερμος δὲ τὸν ἡδὺν ὃς εὕρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλὰς
ἦχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα τὸ πενταμέτρου,
καίετο μὲν Ναννοῦς, πολλῷ δ' ὑπὸ πολλάκι λωτῷ
κηρωθεὶς κώμους εἶχε σὺν Ἐξαμύῃ.
ἦχθετο δ' Ἑρμόβιον τὸν ἀεὶ βαρὺν ἡδὲ Φερεκλῆν
ἐχθρὸν μισήσας οἷ' ἀνέπεμψεν ἔπη.
Λυδῆς δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτι
πληγεὶς Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῖμ' ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ·
Σαρδιανὴν δὲ θανοῦσαν ὑπὸ ξυρὴν θέτο γαῖαν
κλαίων. Αἰξώνιον δ' ἦλθεν ἀποπρολιπὼν
ἄκρον ἔσω Κολοφῶνα, γόων δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους,
γηρὰς ἐκ παντὸς παυσάμενος καμάτου.
Λέσβιος Ἀλκαῖος δὲ πόσους ἀνεδείξατο κώμους,
Σαπφοῦς φορμίζων ἱμερόεντα πόθον,
γιγνώσκεις. ὁ δ' ἀοιδὸς ἀηδόνος ἠράσατ' ὕμνων,
Τήιον ἀλγύνων ἄνδρα πολυφραδίῃ.
καὶ γὰρ τὴν ὁ μελιχρὸς ἐφωμίλησεν Ἀνακρέων
στελλομένην πολλαῖς ἄμμιγα Λεσβιάσιν·
φοίτα δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν λείπων Σάμον, ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτὴν
οἰνηρὴν ὄρεσιν κεκλιμένην πατρίδα,
Λέσβον ἐς εὔοινον· τὸ δὲ μύστιον εἴσιδε Λεκτὼ
πολλάκις αἰολικοῦ κύματος ἀντιπέρας
ἀθὶς δ' οἷα μέλισσα πολιπρήνων Κολωνῶν
λείπουσ' ἐν τραγικαῖς ᾗδε χοροστασίαις
Βάκχον, καὶ τὸν ἔρωτ' ἐγέραιρε Θεωρίδος, οἶσθα
. . Ζεὺς ἔπυρεν Σοφοκλεῖ.

φημὶ δὲ κἀκεῖνον τὸν ἀεὶ πεφυλαγμένον ἄνδρα
καὶ σπανίων μῖσος κτώμενον ἐκ συνόδων
πάσας ἀμφὶ γυναῖκας, ὑπὸ σκολιοῦ τυπέντα
τόξου νυκτερινὰς οὐκ ἀποθέσθ' ὀδύνας.
ἀλλὰ Μακηδονίης πάσας κατενίσατο λαύρας,
Αἰγειὼ μέθεπεν δ' Ἀρχέλεω ταμίην,
εἰσόκε σοὶ δαίμων, Εὐριπίδη, εἶρετ' ὄλεθρον
Ἀμφιβίου στυγνῶν ἀντιάσαντι κυνῶν
ἄνδρα δὲ τὸν Κυθέρηθεν, ὃν ἐθρέψαντο τιθῆναι
Βάκχου, τὸν λωτοῦ πιστότατον ταμίην,
Μούσαις παιδευθέντα Φιλόξενον. οἷα τιναχθεὶς
Ὀρτυγίην ταύτης ἦλθε διὰ πτόλιος,
γιγνώσκεις, αἴουσα μέγαν πόθον, ὃν Γαλατείης
αὐτοῖς μηλείοις θήκαθ' ὑπὸ προγόνοις.
οἶσθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοιδόν, ὃν Εὐριπίδου πολιῆται
Κῷοι χάλκειον στῆσαν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ
Βαττίδα μολπάζοντα θοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλητᾶν
ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλίην.
οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' ὁπόσοι σκληρὸν βίον ἐκτήσαντο
ἀνθρώπων, σκολιὴν βαιόμενοι σοφίην,
οὓς λιτὴ περίπικρα λόγοις ἐσφίγξατο μῆτις
καὶ δεινὴ μύθων κῦρος ἔχουσ' ἀρετή,
οὐδ' οἷδ' οἰνὸν ἔρωτος ἀπετρέψαντο κυδοιμὸν
φαινόμενον, δεινὸν δ' ἦλθον ὑφ' ἡνίοχον.
οἵη μὲν Σάμιον μανίη κατέδησε Θεανοῦς
Πυθαγόρην, ἑλίκων κομψὰ γεωμετρίης
εὑρόμενον καὶ κύκλον, ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθήρ,
βαιῇ ἐνὶ σφαίρῃ πάντ' ἀπομασσόμενον.
οἵῳ δ' ἐχλίηνεν ὃν ἔξοχον ἔχρη Ἀπόλλων
ἀνθρώπων εἶναι Σωκράτη ἐν σοφίῃ
Κύπρις μηνίουσα πυρὸς μένει. ἐκ δὲ βαθείης
ψυχῆς κουφοτέρας ἐξεπόνησ' ἀνίας
οἰκί' ἐς Ἀσπασίης πωλεύμενος· οὐδέ τι τέκμωρ
εὗρε, λόγων πολλὰς εὑρόμενος διόδους.
ἄνδρα δὲ Κυρηναῖον ἔσω πόθος ἔσπασεν Ἰσθμοῦ
δεινός, ὅτ' ἀπιθάνης Λαΐδος ἠράσατο

ὀξὺς Ἀρίστιππος, πάσας δ' ἠνήνατο λέσχας
φείγων, οὐδ' ἀνέμων ἐξεφόβησε βία.

APPENDIX F (Cf. p. 275)

From Callimachus's Hymn to Demeter

ἃ μὲν τόσσ' εἰποῖσ' Ἐρυσίχθονι τεῦχε πονηρά.
αὐτίκα οἱ χαλεπόν τε καὶ ἄγριον ἔμβαλε λιμόν,
αἴθωνα, κρατερόν· μεγάλῃ δ' ἐστρεύγετο νούσῳ,
σχέτλιος ὅσσα πάσαιτο, τόσων ἔχεν ἵμερος αὖτις.
εἴκατι δαῖτα πένοντο, δυώδεκα δ' οἶνον ἄφυσσον.
τόσσα Διώνυσον γὰρ ἃ καὶ Δάματρα χαλέπτει.
καὶ γὰρ τῇ Δάματρι συνωργίσθη Διόνυσος.
οὔτε μιν εἰς ἐράνως οὔτε ξυνδείπνια πέμπον
αἰδόμενοι γονέες. προχανὰ δ' εὑρίσκετο πᾶσα.
ἦνθον Ἰτωνιάδος μιν Ἀθαναίας ἐπ' ἄεθλα,
Ὀρμενίδαι καλέοντες· ἀπ' ὧν ἠρνήσατο μάτηρ·
οὐκ ἐνδοῖ· χθιζὸς γὰρ ἐπὶ Κρανῶνα βέβηκε,
τέλθος ἀπαιτήσων ἑκατὸν βόας. ἦνθε Πολυξώ,
μάτηρ Ἀκτορίωνος, (ἐπεὶ γάμον ἄρτνε παιδὶ)
ἀμφότερον, Τριόπαν τε καὶ υἱέα, κικλήσκουσα·
τὰν δὲ γυνὰ βαρύθυμος ἀμείβετο δακρυχέουσα,
νεῖταί τοι Τριόπας· Ἐρυσίχθονα δ' ἤλασε κάπρος
Πίνδου ἀν' εὐάγκειαν, ὁ δ' ἐννέα φάεα κεῖται.
δειλαία, φιλότεκνε, τί δ' οὐκ ἐψεύσαο, μᾶτερ;
δαίννεν εἰλαπίνας τις; ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις Ἐρυσίχθων.
ἄγετό τις νύμφαν; Ἐρυσίχθονα δίσκος ἔτυψεν,
ἢ ἔπεσ' ἐξ ἵππων, ἢ ἐν Ὀθρυῒ ποίμνι' ἀριθμεῖ.
ἐνδόμυχος δ' ἧπειτα πανήμερος εἰλαπιναστὰς
ἤσθιε μυρία πάντα· κακὰ δ' ἐξάλλετο γαστήρ
αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἔδοντι. τὰ δ' ἐς βυθὸν οἷα θαλάσσας
ἀλεμάτως ἀχάριστα κατέρρεεν εἴδατα πάντα.
ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιών, ὡς ἀελίῳ ἔνι πλαγγών,
καὶ τούτων ἔτι μείζον ἐτάκετο· μέσφ' ἐπὶ νευρὰς
δειλαίῳ ἶνές τε καὶ ὀστέα μοῦνον ἔλιφθεν.

κλαῖε μὲν ἁ μάτηρ, βαρὺ δ' ἔστενον αἱ δύ' ἀδελφαί,
χὠ μαστός, τὸν ἔπινε, καὶ αἱ δέκα, πολλάκι, δῶλαι.
καὶ δ' αὐτὸς Τριόπας πολιαῖς ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἔβαλλε,
τοῖα τὸν οὐκ ἀΐοντα Ποσειδάωνα καλιστρέων·
ψευδοπάτωρ, ἴδε τόνδε τεοῦ τρίτον· εἴπερ ἐγὼ μὲν
σεῦ τε καὶ Αἰολίδος Κανάκης γένος. αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο
τοῦτο τὸ δείλαιον γένετο βρέφος. αἴθε γὰρ αὐτὸν
βλητὸν ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμαὶ χέρες ἐκτερέϊξαι.
νῦν δὲ κακὰ βούβρωστις ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι κάθηται·
ἦ οἱ ἀπάστασον χαλεπὰν νόσον· ἠέ μιν αὐτὸς
βύσκε λαβών. ἁμαὶ γὰρ ἀπειρήκαντι τρίπεζαι.
χῆραι μὲν μάνδραι, κενεαὶ δέ μοι αὔλιες ἤδη
τετραπόδων. ἤδη γὰρ ἀπηρνήσαντο μίγειροι.
ἀλλὰ καὶ οὐρῆας μεγαλᾶν ὑπέλισαν ἁμαξᾶν,
καὶ τὰν βῶν ἔφαγεν, τὰν Ἑστίᾳ ἔτρεφε μάτηρ,
καὶ τὸν ἀεθλοφόρον καὶ τὸν πολεμήϊον ἵππον,
καὶ τὰν αἴλουρον, τὰν ἔτρεμε θηρία μικκά.
μέσφ' ὅτε μὲν Τριόπαο δόμοις ἔνι χρήματα κεῖτο,
μῶνοι ἄρ' οἰκεῖοι θάλαμοι κακὸν ἠπίσταντο.
ἀλλ' ὅτε τὸν βαθὺν οἶκον ἀνεξήραινον ὀδόντες,
καὶ τοθ' ὁ τῶ βασιλῆος ἐνὶ τριώδοισι καθῆστο,
αἰτίζων ἀκόλως τε καὶ ἔκβολα λύματα δαιτός.

APPENDIX G (Cf. p. 285)

Fragments of Callimachus's *Hecalé* (Ed. Gomperz)

Column I

ὡς ἴδον, ο[ἶδ'] ἅμα πάντες ὑπ[έτρ]εσαν ἠδ' [ἐλίασ]θεν
ἄνδρα μέγαν καὶ θῆρα πελώριον ἄντ[α ἰ]δέσθαι,
μέσφ' ὅτε δὴ Θησεύς φιν ἀπόπροθι μακρὸν ἄϋσε·
μίμνετε θαρσήεντες, ἐμῷ δέ τις Αἰγέϊ πατρὶ
νείμενος ὥστ' ὤκιστος ἐς ἄστυπον ἀγγελιώτης
ὡς ἐνέποι, πολέων κεν ἀναψύξειε μεριμνέων
Θησεὺς οὐχ [ἑκὰς υἱός,] ἀπ' εὐρύοπος Μαραθῶνος

ζωὸν ἄγων τὸν ταῦρον. ὁ μὲν φάτο, τοὶ δ' ἀΐοντες
πάντες, ἰὴ παιῆον ἀνέκλαγον, αὖθι δὲ μίμνον.
οὐχὶ νότος τόσσην γε χύσιν κατεχεύατο φύλλων
οὐ βορέης οὐδ' αὐτὸς ὅτ' ἔπλετο φυλλοχόος μ[ε]ίς,
ὅσσα τότ' ἀγρῶσται περί τ' ἀμφί τε Θησέϊ βάλλον, κτλ.

Column IV (probably an earlier part of the poem)

δεί]ελος, ἀλλ' ἢ νὺξ ἢ ἔνδιος ἢ ἔσσετ' ἠώς,
εὖτε κύραξ, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν κύκνοισιν ἐρίζοι
και γάλακι χροιὴν καὶ κύματος ἄκρῳ ἀώτῳ
κυάνεον φὴ πίσσαν ἐπὶ πτερὸν οὐλοὸν ἕξει,
ἀγγελίης ἐπίχειρα τά οἱ ποτε Φοῖβος ὀπάσσει,
ὁππότε κεν Φλεγύαο Κορωνίδος ἀμφὶ θυγατρὸς
ἴσχνι πληξίππῳ σπομένης μερόν τι πύθηται.
τὴν μὲν ἄρ' ὡς φαμένην ὕπνος λάβε τὴν δ' αἰόνσιαν.
καδδραδέτην δ' οὐ πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρόνον, αἶψα γὰρ ἦλθεν
στιβήεις ἄγχουρος· ἴτ' οὐκέτι χεῖρες ἔπαγροι
φιλητέων· ἤδη γὰρ ἐωθινὰ λύχνα φαείνει·
ἀείδει καὶ πού τις ἀνὴρ ὑδατηγὸς ἰμαῖον
ἔγρει καί τιν' ἔχοντα παρὰ πλόον οἰκίον ἄξων
τετριγὼς ὑπ' ἄμαξαν, ἀνιάζουσι δὲ πυκνοὶ
δμῶοι χαλκῆες κωφώμενοι ἔνδον ἀκουήν.

APPENDIX H (Cf. p. 293)

Fragment of Rhianus

Ἦ ἄρα δὴ μάλα πάντες ἀμαρτίνοοι πελόμεσθα
ἄνθρωποι, φέρομεν δὲ θεῶν ἑτερόρροπα δῶρα
ἀφραδέϊ κραδίῃ· βιότοιο μὲν ὅς κ' ἐπιδευὴς
στρωφᾶται, μακάρεσσιν ἐπὶ ψόγον αἰνὸν ἰάπτει
ἀχνύμενος, σφετέρην δ' ἀρετὴν καὶ θυμὸν ἀτίζει,
οὐδέ τι θαρσαλέως νοέειν ἔπος οὐδέ τι ῥέξαι,
ἐρρηγώς, ὅθι τ' ἄνδρες ἐχεκτέανοι παρέωκτιν,
καί οἱ θυμὸν ἴδωνται κατηφείη καὶ ὀΐζύς.

ὃς δέ κεν εὐχθῇσι, θεὸς δ' ἐπὶ ὄλβον ὀπάζῃ
καὶ πολυκοιρανίην, ἐπιλήθεται οὔνεκα γαῖαν
ποσσὶν ἐπιστείβει, θνητοὶ δέ οἱ εἰσὶ τοκῆες,
ἀλλ' ὑπεροπλίῃ καὶ ἁμαρτωλῇσι νόοιο
ἶσα Διὶ βρομέει, κεφαλὴν δ' ὑπέραυχον ἀνίσχει,
καίπερ ἐὼν ὀλίγος, μνᾶται δ' εὔπηχυν Ἀθήνην,
ἠέ τιν' ἀτραπιτὸν τεκμαίρεται Οὐλυμπόνδε,
ὥς κε μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀμίθμιος εἰλαπινάζῃ.
ἡ δ' Ἄτη ἁπαλοῖσι μετατρωχῶτα πόδεσσιν
ἄκρῃς ἐν κεφαλῇσιν ἀνώιστος καὶ ἄφαντος
ἄλλοτε μὲν γραίῃσι νεωτέρῃ, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ὁπλοτέρῃσι γρηῒς ἐφίσταται ἀμπλακίῃσιν,
Ζηνὶ θεῶν κρείοντι Δίκῃ τ' ἐπίηρα φέρουσα.

APPENDIX I (Cf. p. 380)

ONE of the long Greek disputes concerning boundary land—disputes far more interminable than any Chancery suit—was that between the island of Samos and the city of Priene concerning a strip of the mainland on the Prienian frontier, called in later documents ἡ Βατινητὶς χώρα. Our notices concerning the early stages of the dispute are only literary. Plutarch tells (*Quaest. Graec.* 20) of a war about 540 B.C., in which the Samians were defeated with the loss of 1000 men, and so gave up for the time their claim. On this occasion Priene was strongly supported by Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos (cf. *CIG* 2254, 15-19). Six years after the settlement the Samians took their revenge, and re-occupied the territory; but by the mediation of Bias of Priene they were induced to withdraw from it. The next reference to the matter is in Thucydides (i. 115), who says that a war broke out (in 440 B.C.) between Miletus and Samos concerning Priene. It is not unlikely that the border dispute was, if not the whole, at least a partial, cause of this war. The result was that Samos was defeated and made tributary to Athens by Perikles, and the Prienians apparently held the land so long in question. From this time onward our knowledge comes from inscriptions. It appears from CCCC and CCCCIII of the

Inscriptions of the British Museum that Alexander the Great probably made an award in favour of Priene, which had certainly opened its gates to him. From the statements in CCCCIII 145-146, of the same collection, it appears that Antigonus, while king of Asia Minor, also made an award; the most likely sense of this very mutilated passage being that he told both parties to abide by Alexander's decision. We have next (*CIG* 2254) a letter from King Lysimachus (somewhere between 300 and 280 B.C.), which certainly gave an award, but alas! that part of the inscription is broken off. Mr. Hicks shows reasons that we should place the document late in the reign (287-281 B.C.), and that it was in favour of the Prienians.

We now come to the elaborate award of the Rhodians (British Museum CCCCIII), who were invited to arbitrate concerning a fort called Κάριον, and the land surrounding it. I assume this to be identical with the Βατινητίς already mentioned, but this term now recurs only once (l. 45). Accordingly a Rhodian Commission was appointed, and delegates from Samos and Priene first appeared before it at Rhodes; then the arbitrators visited the disputed localities, and listened to arguments on the spot; the final hearing took place in the Artemision at Ephesus. Mr. Hicks fixes the date at about 240 B.C. from the allusions in the text. The preamble of the Rhodian award rehearses the circumstances of the arbitration with care, and holds that the claim of Priene to the Karion is fully proved. The Commissioners add that they have drawn up two official copies of their award. They then recite at length (ll. 45-154) the arguments on both sides, and sum up in favour of Priene. Appended is a specification of the exact boundaries between Samian and Prienian territory; of this most part is lost. The vital question at issue was this: Was the occupation by Priene a modern encroachment, or not? The arguments *pro* and *con* are based upon inscriptions, also on written histories, and on the circumstances of previous arbitrations. But the reader must seek the intricate details in Mr. Hicks's commentary. The Prienians cite the *Histories* of Maeandrius of Miletus, the customs at the Pan-Ionic festival. They allude to a στάσις and a tyranny at Priene, when the democracy had fled to Karion and murdered the garrison, not because they had made a new conquest, but because the soldiers were partisans of the tyrant. Not only had they

held Karion for two years, but after their return (*circa* 300 B.C.) had sold over forty lots of the disputed land. The Samians cite authorities on the other side, Duris and Theopompus, and several more but little known to us. But the arbitrators affirm that all this testimony is in favour of Priene, with the exception of Maeandrius's *Histories*, 'a book of which the authenticity is commonly doubted.' They also hold that the Samians had repeatedly in former discussions acquiesced in the title of Priene. This is the substance of the elaborate award of Rhodes. It gives us a practical insight into the importance of Rhodes as a mediator in these inter-politic troubles, and of the thoroughly business-like way in which an important affair of this kind was transacted.

When Manlius Vulso, after his defeat of the Galatians in 189 B.C., undertook the regulation of Asia Minor along with ten commissioners sent from Rome, the disputants came before a very different court. It appears more than probable that the Samians bribed him to reverse the Rhodian decision; for a generation later (135 B.C.) the Roman Senate, in a decision partially preserved in the British Museum (CCCCV), completely ignores the action of Manlius, to which the Samians now appealed, and decides that they adhere to the careful settlement made by the Rhodians.

Such is an abstract of the history of this quarrel taken from Mr. Hicks's admirable Introduction to Part III. of the *Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum* (1886).

INDEX

ABANTIDAS of Sicyon, 325
Abdera, 493
Aboukir, battle of, 469
About, Edmond, his *Roi des Montagnes*, 392
Abruzzi, the, 72
Abu Simbel, inscriptions of Greek mercenaries at, 179
Abydos, suicide of its inhabitants, 577 *sq.*
Abyssinia, 287
Academy at Athens, the, 156 *sq.*, 408
Acarnania, 7
Acarnanians, the, 22; their application for Roman protection, 479
Achaea, 7, 8, 99, 318, 326, 419; deportation of its chief men to Rome, 601 *sq.*
Achaean League, the, 334 *sq.*, 350, 370, 382 *sq.*, 432, 449, 478, 498, 533, 556, 566, 573, 586, 588 *sq.*, 599, 602, 610; its rise, 7 *sq.*, 38, 233 *sq.*; its struggle with Antigonus Doson, 385 *sq.*; sketch of, 393 *sq.*; its policy under Roman sway, 481 *sq.*; as arbitrator, 583
Achaeans, the, 468 *sq.*; their sudden increase of wealth, 7; in Syrian army, 425, 432; their chief men carried to Italy, 485
Achaeus, 335, 343, 378 *sq.*, 420, 423 *sq.*, 433, 436, 438, 573, 582, 609; betrayal of, 425 *sq.*, 438 *sq.*
Achilles, 100
—— Tatius, on Alexandria, 212
Acilius, C., 610
Acontius and Cydippe, love-story of, 253 *sq.*, 289
Acroceraunian Mountains, the, 85
Acrocorinthus, capture of, by Antigonus Gonatas, 228 *sq.*
Acropolis (of Athens), the, 62
Actium, battle of, 555
Adaeus, commander of Bubastus, 458
Adelphi gods, the, 214
Aden, 308
Adoniazusae, the, of Theocritus, 285, 299
Adonis, the Syrian, 201, 227
Adule, 308; inscription at, 192, 305, 344, 346
Aeacus, 23; supposed ancestor of Macedonian kings, 2
Aeantides, tragic writer, 295
Aegae, 232; tomb of Macedonian kings at, 446
Aegean Sea, the, 40, 103, 225, 493
—— Isles, the, 559; their political condition under the Diadochi, 99 *sq.*
Aegina, 583, 589, 591; acquired by Eumenes II. of Pergamum, 337
Aegion, 450
Aelian, on Ptolemy Philopator, 533
Aemilius Paullus, 216, 477, 500, 556, 570, 603 *sq.*
Aeneas origin of Roman kings, 100
Aeneas, 101
—— inventor of fire-signals, 558
Aeneid, the, 361; love story in, 257, 259, 288 *sq.*

Aenesidemus, 155
Aenos, 358
Aeschines, impeached by Demosthenes, 1; on Alexander's Eastern campaign, 5; on accomplishments of Philip II., 21; his eloquence, 364, 419
Aeschylus, ideal portraits of, 119; artificiality of, 240; modern editions of his plays, 124
Aethiopia, 179, 222
Aetion, his picture of marriage of Alexander, 363 *sq.*
Aetolia, 8, 99; exiles restored to, 14, 274
Aetolian League, the, 7 *sq.*, 335, 383, 385, 562; sketch of, 391 *sq.*; its policy after Cynoscephalae, 471 *sq.*
Aetolians, the, 22, 32, 106, 379, 467, 485, 581, 584, 587, 598, 606; their sudden increase of wealth, 7; in Syrian army, 425, 431; their war with Philip V., 452; appeal to Antiochus III., 480 *sq.*
Agamemnon, 26, 100
Agatharchides, on luxury of Alexander the Great, 28; on taste of Ptolemy II. for natural history, 215; on Hegesias, 342
Agathocleia, mistress of Ptolemy Philopator, 454 *sq.*
Agathocles, minister of Ptolemy Philopator, 433; his schemes and fall, 453 *sq.*
—— of Syracuse, 320, 322
—— (son of Lysimachus), 46, 77, 220
Agelaos of Aetolia, 451, 473
Agis III., king of Sparta, 230, 316 *sq.*, 382, 395
Agnonides, 145; orator, 89, 91
Agrigentum, 320
Agrippa, 516
Agron, king of Illyrium, 383
Akko, 328
Alabama question, the, 365
Albinus, Aulus Postumius, Graecising Roman, 607
Alcaeus, lyric poetry of, 269
Alcibiades, 374; compared to Demetrius Poliorketes, 76; luxury of, 113
Alcman, 269
Alexander I. (King of Macedon), 20
—— III. of Macedon (the Great), 9, 10, 44, 48, 49, 53, 118, 189, 257, 415; effects of his life, 1 *sq.*; death, 2, 15, 29 *sq.*, 36; his contempt for Spartan opposition, 3; his democratic policy in Asia Minor, 12 *sq.*; gives himself divine honours, 13 *sq.*; orders return of Greek exiles, 13 *sq.*, 83; his policy of national fusion, 15; his life epitomises history of Hellenism, 16 *sq.*; regarded as the ideal monarch, 19 *sq.*; his novel position in Greece, 20; educated as a Hellene, with Hellenic sympathies, 21 *sq.*, 26; his supreme authority, 24; marries a second wife, 26; his luxuriousness, 27 *sq.*; his physical recreations, 30 *sq.*; his innovations in art of war, 32 *sq.*; his personal bravery, 33, 55; estimates of, by modern historians, 33 *sq.*; his 'marriage' policy, 34; his 'Medising' tendencies, 34 *sq.*; his relations to art, 35; his heirs, 38; his generals, 73; his relations with Rhodes, 102 *sq.*; effects of his conquests on Greek social life, 111 *sq.*; murders Clitus, 141 *sq.*; his foundation of Alexandria, 172 *sq.*; his tomb at Alexandria, 211; epigrams on statue of, 263; picture of his marriage, by Aetion, 363 *sq.*; visits Jerusalem, 504; protects Jews, 504 *sq.*, 549; his imperialism, 617; relations with Priene, 632
—— IV., 38, 39, 66, 189, 192; statue of, 194
—— Aetolian miser, story of, in Polybius, 560 *sq.*

Alexander, Bala, 539
—— general of Antiochus III., 574
—— Maccabee sovran, 553
—— nephew of Antigonus Gonatas, 381 *sq.*
—— Polyhistor, on Hellenistic Jews, 528
—— satrap of Persia, 424 *sq.*
—— son of Polyperchon, 87, 89, 92
—— the Aetolian, 230; his *Apollo*, 243, 261, 295
—— the Epirote, 71
Alexandreschata, 326
Alexandria, 35, 57, 119, 126, 138, 156, 169, 185, 189, 326 *sq.*, 453 *sq.*, 494, 499, 524, 586, 595, 615; poetry of, 122; museum of, 160, 206 *sq.*; the centre of Hellenism in third century B.C., 162; Jewish settlements in, 166, 176 *sq.*, 195, 312, 504, 506 *sq.*, 516; its foundation by Alexander the Great, 172 *sq.*; its site, 175 *sq.*; its lack of natural beauty, 177 *sq.*; library of, 206, 209 *sq.*; under Ptolemy Philadelphus, 214 *sq.*, 305; Zoological Gardens at, 217; Pharos at, 222; literary activity at, under Philadelphus, 234 *sq.*; history of its literature under first and second Ptolemies, 239 *sq.*; city life in, 311 *sq.*; its water supply, 343; conservatoire of music at, 406; under Ptolemy Physcon, 539 *sq.*; character of its inhabitants, 541, 549; its literature under later Ptolemies, 543 *sq.*
—— in Troad, 322, 350, 476
Alexandrian literature, 414, 552; sketch of, 239 *sq.*; masterpieces of, 242 *sq.*; the elegy, 251 *sq.*; realism in, 259 *sq.*; the epigram, 263 *sq.*; lyric poetry, 268 *sq.*; the hymn, 271 *sq.*; the epic, 280 *sq.*; the idyll, 282, 294 *sq.*, 296 *sq.*; tragedy, 295 *sq.*; under later Ptolemies, 543 *sq.*, absence of humour from, under later Ptolemies, 592 *sq.*
Alexandrians, the, 101
Alexandrine art, its technique and colossal effects, 121
Alexarchus, brother of Casander, 64
Alexis, on Xenocrates, 144
Alfieri, artificiality of, 240
Aliphera, art of, 116; statue of Athene at, 580
Alketas, 74
Allegorical figures in Greek art, 119 *sq.*
—— literature, the, of Jews, 550 *sq.*
Alpheus, river, 580
Alyria, in Acarnania, art in, 116
Amalthea, 219
Amasis, king of Egypt, 180 *sq.*
Amastris, in Pontus, 331 *sq.*
Amazons, the, 2, 74
Ambracia, 59, 327, 601; art in, 116
America, 572; Irish exiles in, 82
Ammonius of Barce, 435
Amoebeus of Corinth, 229
Amon, 189
Amorgos, battle of, 94
Amphictyony, the, of Delphi, 411
Amphion, 362
Amphipolis, 500
Amyntas, king of Macedon, 20
—— husband of Kynane, 74
Anacleteria (coronation) of Ptolemy VI., 535
Anacreon, 269 *sq.*
Anagnia, 612 *sq.*
Anaxarchus, 142, 266
Andromachus, father of Achaeus, 378
—— of Aspendus, 435
Andronicus, murderer of Onias, 524
—— Pergamene envoy to Rome, 609
Andros, 146, 589; defeat of Antigonus Gonatas at, 382
Androsthenes of Cyzicus, 427
Anicius, L., praetor, his triumphal display at Rome, 603 *sq.*

Antagoras of Rhodes, 230
Anthology, the Greek, 248, 263 *sq.*, 293
Anticyra, courtesan, 96
Antigone, wife of Pyrrhus, 57
Antigoneia, on Orontes, 46, 327, 412
Antigonids, dynasty of, 164, 204
Antigonis tribe, 93
Antigonus I., Monophthalmos, general of Alexander the Great, 14, 15, 41, 50, 51, 60, 65, 68, 72, 91, 93 *sq.*, 104, 106, 111, 327, 358, 412, 437, 632; his career and death, 36 *sq.*, 43, 45 *sq.*; his proclamation of Greek freedom, 87; his portrait by Apelles, 119; his title of Soter, 173, 632
—— II. (Gonatas), 56, 63, 67, 76, 145, 160, 224, 266, 322, 334 *sq.*, 400; real founder of Macedonian house, 41, 59; defeats Galatae, 168; his relations with Ptolemy Philadelphus, 222; sketch of, 228 *sq.*; his capture of Acrocorinthus, 228 *sq.*; his patronage of Aratus, 247; his career after Chremonidean war, 381 *sq.*
—— III. (Doson), 367, 422, 428 *sq.*, 449, 474, 484, 566; sketch of, 385 *sq.*; his struggle with Achaean League, 385 *sq.*; his war with Sparta, 387; victory at Sellasia, 387; death, 387
—— of Karystos, 44
Antimachus of Colophon, his *Lyde*, 252, 262, 282
Antioch on Orontes, 119, 126, 138, 175, 212, 225 *sq.*, 307, 327, 350, 497 *sq.*, 502, 535, 595, 615; personification of its τύχη, 114, 120; a centre of Hellenism, 163; its rivalry with Alexandria, 226 *sq.*; its water supply, 343; temple of Capitoline Jove at, 498; Jews in, 507, 509, 553 *sq.*; decay of Hellenism in, 553 *sq.*; earthquakes at, 554
Antiochis, daughter of Antiochus III., 496
Antiochis, wife of Attalus, 332
Antiochus I. of Syria (Soter), 41, 53, 59, 75, 222, 225 *sq.*, 273, 332 *sq.*, 357, 596; defeats Galatians, 168
—— II. (Theos), king of Syria, 222, 333 *sq.*, 343, 370, 372, 496
—— III. (the Great), king of Syria, 225, 321, 336, 370, 378, 420, 454 *sq.*, 475, 481, 495, 500, 532, 534, 578, 587; succeeds to throne, 423 *sq.*; why called *the Great*, 426 *sq.*; his war with Rome, 427 *sq.*, 466, 585, 606; relations with Ptolemy Philopator, 433 *sq.*; inroads on Egypt, 464; favours Jews, 507, 522 *sq.*; imports Greeks to Antioch, 553; wins battle of Panion, 567
—— IV. (Epiphanes), king of Syria, 16, 225, 350, 421, 491, 518, 528, 534 *sq.*, 539, 560, 578, 611 *sq.*; his Hellenism, 468; at Rome, 495 *sq.*; sketch of his career, 497 *sq.*; his wars with Egypt, 499; his submission to Rome, 500; his excesses at Jerusalem, 500, 509, 521; his festival at Daphne, 500 *sq.*; his eccentricities, 501 *sq.*; persecution of Jews, 523 *sq.*; improves Antioch, 553
—— Hierax, 333, 336, 344, 350, 356, 385
—— Sidetes, 527, 539
Antipater, general, of Alexander, 3, 28, 30, 41, 63 *sq.*, 70, 72, 74, 76, 83, succeeds Alexander the Great as regent, 39; sketch of his career, 44 *sq.*; his settlement of Athens, 84 *sq.*; embassy of Xenocrates to, 142
Antisthenes, philosopher, 149
—— historian, of Rhodes, 566
Antoninus Liberalis, 262
Antonius, tribune, 492
Apamea, 194, 328, 425, 479, 553
Apelles, 14, 35, 117, 118, 414 *sq.*; his picture of *Calumny*, 120, 218 *sq.*, 364

Apelles, minister of Philip V., 449 *sq.*, 582
Apocrypha, the, 496, 504
Apollo Belvedere, the, 116, 169
Apollodorus Carystius, dramatist of Alexandria, 215
—— tyrant, 170 *sq.*, 303
Apollonia, 384
Apollonides of Sicyon, 588
Apollonius, friend of Demetrius Soter, 612
—— mathematician, 545
—— of Tralles, 363
—— Rhodius, 212, 238, 243, 259, 303, 304, 349, 364, 594; *Argonautics* of, 242, 253, 259, 283, 286 *sq.*; his quarrel with Callimachus, 280, 283 *sq.*
Apollophanes, physician of Antiochus III., 424
Appian, on brutality of Roman nobility, 607; on Roman commissions in East, 609
Aptari goddess, 192
Aptera, in Crete, dedication to Attalus II. at, 590
Aquileia, 358
Arabia, 176, 222, 287
—— Felix, 218
Arabs, the, 513
Arachosia, 427
Aral, sea of, 227
Aramaic language, the, 526, 530
Aratus of Sicyon, 233 *sq.*, 323 *sq.*, 334, 350 *sq.*, 370, 395, 408, 409, 420, 449 *sq.*, 473, 481, 573; luxury of, 113; retakes Corinth from Antigonus Gonatas, 382; his growing power, 386; his alliance with Antigonus Doson, against Cleomenes, 387; his *Memoirs*, 396, 566, 594; instructor of Philip V., 429 *sq.*; fined by arbitration, 583
—— of Soli, 225; *Phaenomena* of, 230, 242, 245 *sq.*, 265, 300, 304, 545; Virgil's debts to, 245 *sq.*, 303, 620 *sq.*
—— Achaean envoy to Rome, 483
Arbitration, in Hellenism, 583 *sq.*
Arcadia, 3, 7, 13, 99, 298, 305, 318, 389, 564; cultivation of music in, 417 *sq.*
Arcadians, the, 32
Arcesilaus, 334; sceptical school of, 399 *sq.*; daily habits of, 592
—— *Life of*, by Diogenes Laertius, 334
Archedicus, comic poet, 126
Archestratus, 89
Archimedes, mathematician, 545, 594
Architecture, Corinthian style of, 122
Archytas of Tarentum, 230
Areus, king of Sparta, 515
Argolis, 298
Argonautics, the, of Apollonius Rhodius, 242, 253, 259, 283, 286 *sq.*
Argos, 8, 59, 86, 98, 111, 138, 273, 313, 325, 326, 583, 594
Arianus, officer of Ptolemy Philopator, 439 *sq.*
Ariarathes III., king of Cappadocia, 496
—— IV., king of Cappadocia, 496
—— V., king of Cappadocia, 496 *sq.*, 527
Arion of Alexandria, 512
Aristaenetus, his *résumé* of story of Acontius and Cydippe, 253
Aristaenus, of Achaean League, 588
Aristarchus, Homeric critic, 494, 543 *sq.*, 548
Aristeas (pseudo-), 197; on amusements of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 223; quoted by Josephus, 507 *sq.*, 528, 529
Aristeides, painter of Corinth, 602
Aristippus, philosopher, 149
—— of Argos, 370, 583
Aristo of Alexandria, 234
Aristobulus, his exposition of the early scriptures, 530, 551
—— Maccabee sovran, 553
Aristodemus of Miletus, 9
Aristogiton, statue of, 13
Aristomenes, Acarnanian, 461 *sq.*; tutor of Ptolemy V., 468 *sq.*, 534

Aristomenes, the hero of Messene, 101
Aristonicus, athlete, 569
Aristophanes of Byzantium, 101; Homeric critic, 544 *sq.*, 548, 594
—— poet, 94, 125 *sq.*, 402, 593
Aristotimos of Elis, 228
Aristotle, 61, 139, 143, 157, 211, 268, 319, 547; tutor of Alexander the Great, 21; his revision of *Iliad*, 26; on athletic training of Greeks, 31; his Hellenic prejudices, 34; his lack of style, 123; his *Polity of the Athenians*, 124; his sketches of character, 127; his contemporary influence, 141; his methods, 148; his precepts of government, 306; on spiritual conversion, 308; on Dionysiac artists, 411; his belief in moral influence of art, 417
Arles, 513
Arrian, 14; his history of Alexander's campaigns, 19, 205; on Alexander's manifesto to Darius, 21, 61; on luxury of Alexander, 28; on death of Alexander, 29 *sq.*; on Hephaestion, 42; on murder of Clitus, 141 *sq.*;
Arsaces, founder of Parthian kingdom, 334
Arsinoe, as a title for cities, 314
—— as royal name in Egypt, 536
—— city in Aetolia, 49
—— in Crete, 307
—— second wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 49, 77, 214, 272, 311, 331, 345; her force of character, 220 *sq.*
—— queen of Ptolemy IV. Philopator, 454, 463
Arsinoite nome, the (*see* Fayyum)
Art, the moral influence of, 417 *sq.*
Artapanos, his mythical account of Moses, 530
Artemis (the Vatican), 116
Artemisia, 103
Arthur, Round Table of, 167
Artificiality in literature, 239 *sq.*
Artists, professional, in Greece, 410 *sq.*
Aryan barons, the, 34, 53
Asander, 41
Asclepiades, epigrams of, 264
Asia, 82, its 'marriage' to Europe by Alexander the Great, 34, 64; three geographical lines of separation in, 52 *sq.*
Asia Minor, 39, 40, 46, 47, 84, 99; position of, after Alexander's death, 10 *sq.*; return of Greek exiles to, 15; similarity of social life throughout, 111; Hellenism in, under Romans, 487 *sq.*; its prosperity under later Hellenism, 596
Asianic school of eloquence, the, 339 *sq.*
Asinaria, the, 132 *sq.*
Asinius Pollio, 363
Assaye, battle of, 168
Assyrian Empire, Jews in, 505 *sq.*
Astarte, worship of, 227
Astymedes of Rhodes, 492, 584 *sq.*
Astypalaea, 145
Athenaeus, 28, 161; on Uranopolis, 64; on courtesans, 131; quotes Alexis, 144; on banishment of philosophers by Lysimachus, 145; on an answer of Delphic oracle, 145; on coronation festival of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 216; on mistresses of Philadelphus, 220; his quotations from literature of Alexandria, 243, 262; on Tarentum, 320; on Byzantium, 322; on Eumenes of Amastris, 333; on Byzantines, 372; on extravagance of Ptolemy Philopator, 521; on Ptolemy Philometor, 538; on Ptolemy Physcon, 539, 543
Athene, 62, 95
Athenians, the, 61
Athenodorus of Pergamum, 398
Athens, 8, 12, 102, 162, 207, 384, 453, 543, 565, 586, 610; policy of, towards Alexander and his successors, 3 *sq.*; growth of its schools of philosophy after Alexander's death, 4; restoration of its exiles by Alexander, 14 *sq.*; its obstinate resistance

to Alexander, 15; its real prosperity under Alexander and his successors, 16; its relations with Dem. Poliorketes, 61 *sq.*; its relations with Olympias, 71: sketch of its social and political life, 80 *sq.*; burdens of the rich in, 80 *sq.*; restoration of exiles to, by Polyperchon, 86 *sq.*; occupation of, by Polyperchon, 88 *sq.*; occupation of, by Dem. Poliorketes, 91 *sq.*; its social life different from that of Thebes, 110; its social life affected by conquests of Alexander the Great, 111 *sq.*; its social life as reflected in New Comedy, 126 *sq.*, 133 *sq.*; exposure of children at, 129 *sq.*; the mob at, character of, 135 *sq.*; apathy of better classes at, 136 *sq.*; monastic seclusion of its serious men, 138 *sq.*; its position in third century B.C., 314 *sq.*; its relations with Pergamum, 334 *sq.*; its refusal to join Achaean League, 386; a centre of education at end of third century B.C., 401 *sq.*; decay of oratory at, 409 *sq.*; temple of Olympian Jove at, 498; bilingual inscriptions at, 507; use of torture at, 573; visited by Attalus I., 590
Athos, Mount, 64, 121, 359
Atreus, Treasury of, at Mycenae, 114
Attaleia, fort, 332
Attalists, the, 412
Attalus I., king of Pergamum, 17, 35, 168, 327, 332, 334 *sq.*, 355, 378, 451, 464 *sq.*; his *Memoirs* of Alexander, 339, 472, 589; visits Athens, 590
—— II., king of Pergamum, 75, 493, 588 *sq.*, 609
—— stoa of, 337
Attic dialect, the, 111
Attica, 81, 305
Atys, the, of Catullus, 243, 269 *sq.*
Auge, 516
Augustan age, the, 122
Augustus Caesar, Emperor, 492; his settlement of Egypt, 306, 449, 549, 597, 617
Aulus Gellius, on embassy of Athenian philosophers to Rome, 610
Aurelii, the, 133
Aurelius Victor, referred to, 66
Aztecs, the, 112

BAALBEC, ruins of, 503, 554
Babylon, 28, 38, 39, 40, 50, 83, 172, 192, 220, 345, 506; revolt of Macedonians at, 14
Babylonia, 522
Bacchic mysteries, the, 71
Bacchides, the, 133
Bacchis, in *Hecyra*, 132.
Bacchus, 94
Bactria, 34, 222, 326, 344, 393, 426
Bactrian kings, the, 167
Baedeker, his *Lower Egypt*, 272
Balearic Isles, the, 146
Barcides, the, 384
Barsine, mistress of Alexander the Great, 66, 104
Bastards, royal, their position at Macedonian court, 26
Βατωνῆς χώρα, ἡ, 631 *sq.*
Batoum (Trebizond), 357
Batrachomyomachia, the, 268
BCH (*Bull. de corr. hellénique*), 51, 174, 222, 232, 306, 308, 313, 334, 369, 379, 392, 403, 410, 490, 493, 588
Beethoven, 341, 417
Bekker, Im., his edition of Aratus, 246
Bel, tower of, 122
Belgians, the, as international arbiters, 9
Berenike, a title for cities, 314
—— royal name in Egypt, 536
—— infant daughter of Ptolemy III., 347 *sq.*
—— wife of Ptolemy III., 342 *sq.*; death of, 423
Bergk, on Galatae, 167
Berlin, Museum of, its publication on Pergamum, 331

Bernays, on Theophrastus' *Tract on Piety*, 145
Bernhardy, on Museum of Alexandria, 208
Berosus, his annals of Syria, 225, 528
Bethshan (Scythopolis), 328
Bias of Priene, 631
Bissell, on *Wisdom of Solomon*, 551
Bithynia, 357, 468, 487; war of succession in, 371 *sq.*
Black Sea (Euxine), 165, 220, 497; countries on, 356 *sq.*
Blass, Prof. F., 240, 340; his *Attische Beredsamkeit*, 20
Boeotia, 98, 128, 298
Boeotian inscriptions, 97
Boeotians in Antioch, 553
Bolingbroke, philosophy of, 128
Bolis, officer in the pay of Ptolemy Philopator, 438 *sq.*
Bologna, colonnades at, 212
Borysthenes, on Black Sea, 375
Bosporus, the, 322, 354, 356, 374
Brachmans, the, 48
Brahmaputra, the, 172
Brasidas, 79
Brennus, 379
Bret Harte, his *Heathen Chinee*, 294
Breton, the, 616
British Museum Papyri, 213; its inscriptions on dispute between Samos and Priene, 632 *sq.*
Bruchium, 196, 223, 224
Brugsch, H., on proclamation of Ptolemy Soter, 188
Brunn, on Pergamum, 337; on Greek art at Rome, 603
Brussels, 9
Bubastis, 181, 458, 537
Buckle, on household of Louis XIV., 25
Buddhist missionaries to Egypt, 223
Bury, J. B., Mr., on Lycophron, 302; his reprint of Freeman's *History of Federal Government*, 393
Buto, land of, 190
Byzantium, 11, 99, 232, 322, 356, 358, 370, 371 *sq.*, 490; its commercial war with Rhodes, 373 *sq.*, 433

CADMEA, the, of Thebes, 98
Caecilius, Roman officer, 478
Cairo, 66, 542
Calabria, 298
Calabrian, the, 616
Calamis, sculptor, 323
Calendar, reform of, in Egypt, 348
California, U.S.A., 394
Callicrates, envoy to Rome, 483
Callimachus, 300, 350; on invasion of Galatae, 169; *Hymns* of, 242, 265, 268 *sq.*, 271, 274 *sq.*; his *Ibis*, 243, 259 *sq.*, 268, 284; his *Coma Berenices*, 243, 259; his epigram on Aratus, 245, 249; his *Bath of Pallas*, 253, 260; his Αἴτια, 253 *sq.*, 284; his *Hecale*, 253, 284 *sq.*, 629 *sq.*; his love-story of Acontius and Cydippe, 253 *sq.*; his epigrams, 264; his story of Erysichthon, 275, 628 *sq.*; his quarrel with Apollonius Rhodius, 280, 283 *sq.*; on maids of honour at Alexandrian Court, 311; his *Hymn to Demeter*, 592
Callimedon, 91
Callinus, 158; elegiac poetry of, 251
Calliphon, 170
Callisthenes, philosopher, 142; the romance ascribed to him on life of Alexander the Great, 13, 205, 237
Callixenus, his work on Alexandria, 216 *sq.*
Calumny, picture of, 120, 218 *sq.*, 364
Cambylus of Crete, 438 *sq.*
Cambyses, his invasion of Egypt, 183, 192
Cameiros, 102, 358
Candahar, 326
Canopus, city, 212, 542; star, 249
—— Inscription, 198, 306, 469; full details of, 346 *sq.*

Cappadocia, 222, 496 *sq.*
Cappadocians, the, 598
Caracalla, 211
Cardia, 42
Caria, 67, 165, 327, 385, 387
Carlyle, 266
Carmania, 427
Carneades, agnostic philosopher, 143, 399
Carthage, 384 *sq.*, 461, 486, 556, 595, 601, 612
Carthaginians, the, 221, 452
Carystos, 589
Casander, king of Macedon, 45, 55, 84 *sq.*, 88, 92, 97, 104, 105, 112, 127, 137, 158, 160, 322, 437; his government of Athens, 16; out-spoken character of, 28; his efforts to hold part of Alexander's empire, 39 *sq.*; career of, 64 *sq.*; portraits of, 119
Casandreans, the, of Lycophron, 170
Casandreia, as a title for cities, 314
Caspian Gates, the, 505
—— Sea, the, 74, 227
Catalans, the, 43
Cato, 477, 518
Catullus, his *Coma Berenices*, 243, 344; his *Atys*, 243; his use of Callimachus as a model, 275
Caucasus, the, 427
Caunos, 576
Cavour, Count, 205
Celts, the (Galatae), 59, 100, 116, 225, 273 *sq.*, 293, 322, 332 *sq.*, 357, 389, 393, 410, 476, 580, 633; their invasion of Hellenistic world, 41, 156, 167 *sq.*; in Pergamene sculpture, 337 *sq.*, 374; as mercenaries, 425, 431, 446
Ceramicus, the, 90, 94
Chabbas, 184, 190 *sq.*
Chabrias, portraits of, 119
Chaeron of Sparta, 557
Chaeronea, battle of, 1, 5, 473; theatre at, 410
Chalcedon, on Bosporus, 168, 374
Chalcis, 450
Chaldaeans, the, 504
Champollion, his hieroglyphic discoveries, 202, 345
Chandragupta, 51
Chares of Lindus, 359 *sq.*; love-stories in, 254
Charles I., 142
Charops of Epirus, 482, 607 *sq.*
Chastity, in love-stories of Alexandria, 258
Chelmos Mountains, 8, 419
Chelonis of Sparta, 317 *sq.*
Chersonese, the, 490
Chersonite, epithet of Eumenes, 42
China, 227
Chinese, the, their limitations of foreign trade compared to those of Amasis, 182
Chinnock, Mr., editor of Arrian, 30
Chios, 357; *Soteria* at, 393
Chremonidean war, the, 232 *sq.*, 314, 381
Chremonides of Athens, 356
Christian Church, 552; persecution of, by Herod, 541
Chryseis, wife of Antigonus Doson, 367
Chrysippus, philosopher, 140, 152, 160; his work and influence, 397 *sq.*; list of his works, 234 *sq.*; on athletic training, 404
Chrysis, courtesan, 96
Chrysopolis, 374
Church, the, in Egypt, 180 *sq.*
Cibyra, 576
Cicero, on Greek republics, 78; on *Dialogues* of Aristotle, 123; on Theophrastus, 147; his translations from Aratus of Soli, 245; quotes Polybius on public education, 407; on Demetrius Phalereus, 410; on Antiochus III., 427; on Hannibal's knowledge of Greek, 452; on Polybius, 561; on Octavius, 578; on plunder of Syracuse and of Ambracia by Romans, 601
CIG (*Corpus Inscriptt. Graec.*), 195, 344, 474, 507, 549
Cilicia, 5, 153, 227, 307, 327, 358
Cilician passes, the, 225
Cineas, minister of Pyrrhus, 58

Cinquecento, the, 276
Circeii, 613
Citharistes, the, in Greek comedy, 413
Cities, new, of Diadochi, 326 *sq.*
—— reconstitution of, a leading feature of Hellenistic Asia, 48
Civil Wars, the, of Rome, 598
Classics, the, Alexandrine recension of, 543 *sq.*
Claudius, Emperor, his college at Alexandria, 211, 477
Cleaenetus, 96
Cleanthes, philosopher, 140, 234, 397 *sq.*, 533; *Hymns* of, 271; his hymn to Jove quoted, 277 *sq.*
Cleino, mistress of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 220
Cleitomachus, athlete, 569
Clemens Alexandrinus, 197, 550 *sq.*
Cleombrotus of Sparta, 317 *sq.*
Cleomenes III., king of Sparta, 230, 386, 395, 575, 594; his war with Antigonus Doson, 387; defeated at Sellasia, 387, 422; his policy, 395 *sq.*; retires to Egypt, 421 *sq.*; death, 423
Cleomenic war, the, 387
Cleon, 94
Cleopatra, as royal name in Egypt, 536
—— wife of Philip II., 70
—— daughter of Philip II., 71 *sq.*
—— I., queen of Ptolemy Epiphanes of Egypt, 499, 534 *sq.*, 548, 589
—— II., wife of Ptolemy Physcon, 540 *sq.*
—— VI., queen of Egypt, 468
Cleoxenus, inventor of fire-signals, 558
Clinton, *Fasti* of, 494, 539, 605
Clitus, friend of Alexander the Great, 21
—— general of Polyperchon, 90
Cnidians, the, 106
Cnidos, 99, 102, 273, 358, 575
Cnopias of Allaria, 434
Coele-Syria, 328, 433, 437, 464, 469, 499, 522, 587
Colleges in Athens, at the end of third century B.C., 401 *sq.*
Collignon, M., on ephebic institutions in Hellenistic world, 407
Colophon, 11, 147, 155, 321
Colossus (Helios) of Rhodes, 359 *sq.*, 366
Coma Berenices, the, of Callimachus, 243, 344
Comedy of the Alexandrine age, 123 *sq.*
—— the New, 80, 125 *sq.*, 314, 581, 595
—— the Old, 583
—— the Roman, 125 *sq.*
Commagene, 494
Commons, House of, in earlier England, 23
Companions of Alexander the Great, 32
Comte, Auguste, 159, 547
Conder, Captain, on palace of Hyrcanus, 513 *sq.*
Conon, astronomer, 249
—— general, portraits of, 119
Constantinople, Museum at, 115, 309; conquest of, by Turks, 541
Conze, *Samothrake* of, 310
Corax, Mount, 107
Corcyra, 384; professional comedians at, 411
Corinth, 98, 133, 155, 232, 321, 326, 448, 450, 599; isthmus of, 8, 567; its commercial spirit, 11; treaty of, 15, 84; represented at coronation of Philadelphus, 219; taken by Antigonus Gonatas, 381 *sq.*; taken by Antigonus Doson, 387; destruction of, by Romans, 466, 486, 555, 602 *sq.*; Antigoneia at, 586
Cornelius Nepos, on Hannibal's knowledge of Greek, 452
Coronation of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 215 *sq.*
Cortez, 43
Coruncanius, Roman envoy to Illyrium, 384, 582
Cos (*see* Kos)
Cosmas Indicopleustes, 344

Couat, M., his *Poésie alexandrine*, 239, 256, 262, 269, 271, 283, 286
Courtesan, the, in New Comedy, 131 *sq.*
Courtesans, book of, 80, 131
Cranon, battle of, 41, 93
Craterus, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 76
Crates, philosopher, 142
Cratinus, poet, 593
Cretans, in Syrian army, 425, 431
Crete, 102, 357, 473
Crimea, the, 79
Critias, 144
Critolaus, general of Achaean League, 486, 573, 599
Crocodilopolis in Fayyum, 195, 308
Cromwell, analogy between his military tactics and those of Alexander the Great, 32 *sq.*
Crotona, 320
Crusius, O., on Herondas, 300
Ctesias, love-stories in, 254
Ctesicles, chronicler, 334
Curtius, E., on inferior culture of Macedonians, 22; on prehistoric Greek sovranty, 23
—— Q., 36
Cybele, galliambic poems concerning, 269
Cyclades, the, 298
Cydippe and Acontius, love-story of, 253 *sq.*, 289
Cynaetha, a district of Arcadia, 417 *sq.*
Cynics, the, 399 *sq.*, 591
Cynoscephalae, battle of, 466, 471 *sq.*, 584, 606
Cyprus, 146, 204, 536, 545; acquired by Ptolemy I., 174, 227, 307; government of its cities, 492
Cypselus, 57
Cyrene, 41, 165, 179, 204, 222, 334, 464, 535, 539; acquired by Ptolemy I., 174
Cyzicus, 342, 358, 370, 433, 498

DALMATIA, 358, 383
Damascus, 328, 510
Dame aux Camélias, the, 132
Danae, daughter of Leontium, 344
—— mother-in-law of Tlepolemus, 458
Daniel, Book of, 504, 531, 551
Daphnae (Defenneh or Tahpahnes), discoveries of Mr. Petrie at, 178 *sq.*
Daphne (near Antioch), 500, 524
Daphnis, the, of Dositheos, 295
Dardanians, the, 419; invade Macedonia, 383 *sq.*
Dark ages, the, 18
Darius (Codomannus), 2, 3, 5, 13, 21, 27, 31, 61, 69
—— (Hystaspis), his organisation of Egypt, 184
Davidson, Mr. Strachan, his *Selections from Polybius*, 433
Decapolis, Jewish, the, 510
Defenneh (Tahpahnes or Daphnae), discoveries of Mr. Petrie at, 178 *sq.*
Deinocrates, artist, 35, 121
—— Messenian envoy to Rome, 610
Deinon of Rhodes, cowardice of, 575 *sq.*
Dejanira, 603
Delos, 51, 165, 273; texts at, on *Ptolemaea*, 174; inscription to Rhodians at, 369; gifts of Antiochus Epiphanes to, 498
Delphi, 94, 274, 376, 588; records of Celtic invasion at, 170; inscription at, on *Soteria*, 379; under Aetolian League, 392; *Soteria* at, 393, 410
Delphic Amphictyony, the, 20
—— oracle, the, 145
Delta, the, 272; temple of Ptolemy Philadelphus in, 305
Demades, 85 *sq.*, 147
Demeter, 94; *Hymn to*, 295
Demetria, feasts of Bacchus, 94
Demetrias, last day of every month, 94
—— tribe, 93
Demetrion (month), 94
Demetrius I. of Macedon (Poliorketes), 39, 41, 49, 51, 52, 55, 57, 65, 68, 75, 76, 87, 112, 117,

122, 126, 137, 142 *sq.*, 147, 158, 160, 208, 429, 580; imprisonment and death, 40; relations with his father, 46 *sq.*; his character and career, 59 *sq.*; his occupation of Athens, 91 *sq.*; reconquers Thebes, 98; his siege of Rhodes, 104 *sq.*, 355, 357 *sq.*; portraits of, 119; his title of Soter, 173; restores Sicyon, 323
Demetrius II. of Macedon, son of Antigonus Gonatas, 229, 382 *sq.*, 409
—— of Pharos, 384, 452
—— Phalereus, 87, 92 *sq.*, 97, 106, 112, 124, 126, 134, 147, 155, 206 *sq.*, 410, 566; his patronage of literature, 158 *sq.*; on monarchy, 230
—— son of Philip V., 609
—— Soter, king of Syria, 495, 578, 582; escapes from Rome, 611 *sq.*
—— the Chronographer, 198, 528
—— the Fair, 334, 342 *sq.*, 385, 428
Demochares, politician, nephew of Demosthenes, 96, 97, 126, 137, 143, 147
Democleitus, inventor of fire-signals, 558
Democles, 96
Democracy, mistaken enthusiasm for, 12; excesses of, 92 *sq.*, 144
Democritus, 149
Demosthenes, 2, 5, 16, 20, 44, 46, 84, 97, 113, 123, 410, 412, 565, *sq.*, 592; impeaches Aeschines, 1; portraits of, 119; art of, 240, 340
Demosthenic age, the, 18
Denderah, temple at, 307
Dercyllus, 88
Descartes, Life of (author's), referred to, 142, 595
Deuteronomy, Book of, on *Niddach*, 505
Dexiphanes of Cnidos, 222
Diadochi, the, 36 *sq.*, 388; their confused history, 17; forty-five years' war of, 41; their marriage connexions, 75; pride of, 122; their age not one of philosophical decadence, 146
Diaeus, general of Achaean League, 486, 573, 599
—— of Rhodes, 101
Diagoras, orator, 144
Dialect, common, of Greek, 199
Diaspora, the (*Niddach*), 505
Dicaearchus, Aetolian, 469
—— author of tour in Greece, 128
Dido, 257
Dinarchus (of Corinth), 89
Dio Cassius, 593
Diodorus Siculus, 547; on assemblage of exiles at Olympia, 16, 83; on Demetrius Poliorketes, 60; on Olympias, 70; on Eurydike, 75; on marriage of Polyperchon, 75; deficiency of his history, 79; on Athenian constitution, 81 *sq.*; on Antipater in Athens, 84 *sq.*; on rescript of Polyperchon, 86; on Rhodes, 101 *sq.*; on Philocles of Sidon, 115; on tyrant Apollodorus, 170; on etiquette of Egyptian court, 180; on position of women in Egypt, 187; on desire of Philadelphus to obtain strange beasts, 215; on floods at Rhodes, 365; on athletics in Egypt, 404; on Dionysiac 'artists' at court of Antigonus Monophthalmos, 412; on protest of Lampsacus, 476; on cities of Cyprus, 492; on Hellenistic kings of Cappadocia, 496 *sq.*; on Ptolemy Philometor, 538; on visit of Scipio to Egypt, 542; on plunder of Syracuse by Romans, 601
—— tutor of Demetrius Soter, 611
Diogeneion, the, at Athens, 409
Diogenes, cynic philosopher, 400
—— governor of Athens, 409
—— Laertius, 140, 144, 146, 151, 156, 158, 266; his *Life of Epicurus*, 154; on Antigonus Gonatas, 228; on philosophers of Alexandria, 234; his *Life of Arcesilaos*, 334; on systematising philosophers, 398; on Chry-

sippus, 396, 547; on Ptolemy Philopator, 533; on Pyrrho, 591; on Arcesilaus, 592
Dion Chrysostom, on social life in Syria, 227; his idyll, 242; his *Borysthenitic us*, 326, 375; his sketches of country life in the *Venaticus*, 353; on Mummius, 603
—— town in Macedonia, 447 *sq.*, 580
—— on the Jordan, 328
Dionysia, the, 94
Dionysiac 'artists,' 411 *sq.*
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 477; on Thessalonica, 71; on Caria, 165; on Hegesias, 341
—— of Syracuse, 171, 321
—— of Thrace, 435
Dionysus, 14, 60, 602
Diosemeia of Aratus, 242, 245 *sq.*, 620 *sq.*
Diphilus, 125
Diplomacy, its development in Hellenistic world, 430 *sq.*, 583 *sq.*
Dipylon, the, at Athens, 590
Dirke, 362
Dittenberger, his *Sylloge*, 15; on rescript of Antigonus Monophthalmos, 47; on descent of Seleucids, 305
Divine right of Macedonian kings, 23
Dodona, 447, 580
Dorian Hexapolis, the, 102
Dorians, the, of Syracuse, 321
Dorimachus, Aetolian, 580
Dörpfeld, Dr., on stoa of Eumenes II. at Athens, 588
Dositheos, tragic writer, 295
Doura, 436
Drangene (Drangiana), 427
Dromocleides the Sphettian, 95
Droysen, J. G., 220, 307; on character of Alexander the Great, 33; on Hephaestion, 42; on death of Pyrrhus, 59; his *Gesch. des Hellenismus*, 98; his description of social life at Athens erroneous, 134; on Antigoneia in Syria, 327, on Rhodes, 356, 368, 370
Dublin, demotic papyri at, 186
Dubois, Marcel M., on Achaean and Aetolian Leagues, 393
Dumas, his *Dame aux Camélias*, 132
Dümichen, on temple at Edfu, 346
Duris, historian, 79, 235, 633
Duruy, his *History of Greece*, 66, 319
Dying Gladiator, the, 116, 169, 338
Dyrrhachium, 384

EAST, the, opens a new field to Hellenic enterprise, 2 *sq.*, 8, 10; a general estimate of, under Rome, 555 *sq.*
Ecclesiastes, Book of, 504, 531, 616; its bearing on Jewish Hellenism, 517 *sq.*
Ecclesiasticus, Book of, 197, 353, 518
Echecrates of Thessaly, 434 *sq.*
Edersheim, Dr., on Jewish privileges, 550
Edfu, temple at, 306, 346
Edinburgh, students at, 407
Egypt, 40, 41, 46, 50, 53, 57, 72, 93, 137, 160, 387, 431, 486, 498, 588, 617; Achaean and Aetolian officers in, 8; gives divine honours to Alexander the Great, 13; demotic documents of, on nationality of Macedonians, 22; art of, 119; its place in Hellenistic world, 164; its progress under Ptolemy I., 173 *sq.*; its condition immediately preceding conquest of Alexander the Great, 178 *sq.*; Greek mercenaries in, 178 *sq.*, 181 *sq.*; ecclesiastical courts in, under Amasis, 182; position of women in, 186 *sq.*; Jews in, 196 *sq.*, 504 *sq.*; blending of religions in, 200 *sq.*; finances of, under early Ptolemies, 202; season of vintage in, 217; its civilisation unaffected by Hellenistic culture, 304 *sq.*; its reaction against Hellenism under Ptolemy III., 345 *sq.*; under Ptolemy IV., 421 *sq.*, 520 *sq.*;

its policy towards Rome, 467 *sq.*; invaded by Antiochus Epiphanes, 499; decay of Hellenism in, 532 *sq.*
Egyptian priests, their relations with Ptolemy III., 347 *sq.*
Ehrlich, Bruno, on *Hymns* of Callimachus, 274
Elatea, 89
Eleans, the, 600
Electra, the, of Euripides, 285
Elegy, the Alexandrian, 251 *sq.*
Elephantos, Pythagorean, 230
Eleusinian mysteries, 202
Eleusis, at Alexandria, 212
Elis, 147, 155, 313, 329 *sq.*, 352, 389, 591; plain of, 8
Embassies, their use in Hellenism, 585 *sq.*
Empedocles, 143
Empire of the Ptolemies (author's) referred to, 40, 48, 66, 94, 173, 176, 214, 344, 347; on Rosetta stone, 469, 492, 511, 531, 532
England, 616; its social relations with Ireland, 109
Epaminondas, 20, 32, 293, 313, 473, 565
Eperatus, officer of Achaean League, 450
Ephebi, at Athens, 403 *sq.*
Ἐφημερίδες, Journal of Alexander the Great, 29 *sq.*
Ephesus, 111, 273, 321, 358, 412, 586, 609; wealth of, 11; restored by Lysimachus, 47, 49; portrait of Alexander the Great at, 415; Artemision at, 632
Ephippus, on luxury of Alexander, 28
Ephorus, historian, 235, 417
Epic, the, in literature of Alexandria, 280 *sq.*
Epicharmus, 135
Epicrates of Rhodes, 369
Epictetus, 575
Epicurean philosophy, a school of good manners, 581
Epicureans, the, 519
Epicurus, 62, 127, 134, 140, 143, 234, 344, 397, 400; his speculativeness, 148 *sq.*; his school of philosophy, 153 *sq.*
Epigoni, the, 52, 55, 388
Epigram, the Greek, 242, 263 *sq.*
Epirotes, the, 560 *sq.*
Epirus, 56, 485; depopulation of, by Romans, 597 *sq.*
Epitadeus, ephor, 315
Eratosthenes, astronomer, 349; his *Hermes*, 249 *sq.*; mathematician and geographer, 545 *sq.*, 594
Eretria, 147, 589
Erhardt, 146
Eridanus (Po), the, 287
Eros, at Alexandria, 270
Erotica of Parthenius, 262
Erymanthus, Mount, 8, 107; river, 427
Erysichthon, 592; story of, in Callimachus, 275, 628 *sq.*
Esdras, first book of, 527
Esneh, temple of, 202, 306, 345
Essay on Man, Pope's, 128, 268
Esther, Book of, 527, 551
Etiquette at Hellenistic courts, 581 *sq.*
Etruria, 602
Euboea, 242, 353
Euboeans, in Antioch, 553
Euclid, 209, 545
Eudoxus, astronomy of, 245, 249
Euemerus, sceptic, 276
Euergetae, gods, the, 306
Euergetes, see Ptolemy III.
Eulaeus, eunuch at Egyptian Court, 499, 535, 586
Eumenes (of Cardia), 34, 38, 39, 46, 50, 67, 71, 72, 73, 75; sketch of his life, 41 *sq.*
—— I. of Pergamum, 331 *sq.*
—— II. of Pergamum, 412, 484, 560, 585, 588 *sq.*; his embassy to Rome, 488 *sq.*
Eunostos, harbour at Alexandria, 175
Euphrates, the river, 53, 163, 497
Euripides, 411; his female characters, 288; his fragments found on papyri, 543
Europe, its 'marriage' to Asia by Alexander the Great, 34

Eurydike, wife of Philip Arridaeus, 65, 74 *sq.*
Eurylochus of Magnesia, 434 *sq.*
Eusebius, 197, 551; quotes Alexander Polyhistor, 528
Euthydemus of Magnesia, 426 *sq.*
Eutychides, sculptor, 114
Euxine (Black Sea), countries on, 356 *sq.*
Ewald, on Jews under Antiochus III., 522
Exiles, Greek, restoration of, by Alexander, 14 *sq.*
Exodus, the, as a Greek drama, 197
Ezra, Book of, 527

FABII, the, 133
Fabius Pictor, 528
Fable of the Bees, the, 268
Fables concerning Alexander, 257
Favorinus, 156
Fayyum, the, 181, 195, 226, 308; ephebic institutions in, 407
Festus, on military earthworks among Greeks, 405
Fick, on language of Macedonians, 22
Flamand race, the, 616
Flamininus, T., 86, 472, 602, 606, 608; on army of Antiochus III., 468; his settlement of Greece, 474, 480 *sq.*; Plutarch's *Life* of, 476 *sq.*; his discussion with Philip V., 584, 587
—— L., Roman admiral, 476, 478 *sq.*, 606
Florence, 323, 611; statue of Alexander the Great at, 35
Foucart, on inscription at Orchomenus, 323
Fragmenta Hist. Graec., ed. C. Müller (*FHG*), cited, 103, 128, 305
France, 616
Franciscan monks, the, 400
Franco-German war, the, 388
Fränkel, Max, on inscriptions of Pergamum, 490 *sq.*
Frankish kings, their powers, 24
Freeman, Professor, his *History of Federal Government*, 233, 365, 393
French Academy, the, its classical language, 543
French novels in England, 133
Freudenthal, 530; on Demetrius the Chronographer, 528
Fritzsche, on Theocritus, 240

GALATAE (*see* Celts)
Ganges, the, 172
Garibaldi, 205, 474; compared to Timoleon, 120
Gascon, the, 616
Gaul, 79
Gaza, victory of Antiochus Epiphanes at, 499
Gedrosia, 53, 218
Genesis, Book of, 546
Geneva, 9; its politics compared to those of Athens, 181; arbitration at, 365
Genthius, king of Illyria, 604
Geographi Graeci Minores, ed. C. Müller (*GG*), cited, 215, 342
George III., 25
Georgics of Virgil, 623
Gerasa, 510; ruins of, 502 *sq.*
Gerizim, Mount, 537
Germany, 71, 616
Geryones, the, of Ephippus, 167
Gibbon, style of, 341
Gladiator, the Dying, 116, 160, 338
Golden Fleece, Quest of the, 286
Gomperz, Prof., on *Characters* of Theophrastus, 127; on *Hecale*, 284
Gorgias, the sophist, 142
—— Syrian general, 508
Gortyn, in Crete, 421
Gow, Mr., his *History of Greek Mathematics*, 209, 243, 545
Gracchi, the, 230, 602
Granicus, the, 338
Grasberger, on ephebi, 403, 405 *sq.*
Greece, 39; restoration of exiles to, 14; isolation of its smaller states, 108 *sq.*; a second-rate Hellenistic power, 165; the land question in, in third century B.C., 351; in time of Aratus,

381 *sq.*, 388 *sq.*; settlement of, by T. Flamininus, 474, 480 *sq.*; Romanising party in, 482 *sq.*; depopulation of, 570 *sq.*; its fate under Romans, 599 *sq.*; Italian slaves in, 602
Greek cities, their provincialism under Alexander, 16 *sq.*
—— residents at Rome, 610 *sq.*
—— countries, depopulation of, 313 *sq.*
—— islands, position of, after Alexander's death, 10 *sq.*
—— language, the, spoken in Egypt, 199 *sq.*; Roman knowledge of, 476 *sq.*
—— literature, later, absence of humour in, 592 *sq.*
—— tyrants, 22
Greek World under Roman Sway referred to, 143, 303, 353, 375
Greeks, the, their condition after accession of Alexander, 1 *sq.*, 9 *sq.*; their passion for autonomy, 6; disliked by Macedonians, 10; how affected by influx of Persian wealth, 112 *sq.*; their use of art in religion, 118; settlements of, in Egypt, 176 *sq.*; in time of Aratus, 381 *sq.*; settlements of, in Palestine, 510
Greifswald, 147
Grex, the, in Plautus's *Asinaria*, 133
Grote, on Hellenistic aspirations of Macedonian kings, 20; on prehistoric Greek sovranty, 23; on supreme authority of Alexander the Great, 27; on character of Alexander the Great, 33; on anti-Pythagorean riots in Magna Graecia, 583
Gymnasium at Jerusalem, 514 *sq.*

HADRIAN, theatre of, at Athens, 588
Halcyoneus, son of Antigonus Gonatas, 230, 400
Halicarnassus, 11, 99, 314, 358
Hamdi Bey, on tomb of Sidon, 116, 310
Hamlet, 27
Händel, his *Judas Maccabaeus*, 504
Hannibal, 33, 420 *sq.*, 433, 601 *sq.*; his treaty with Philip V., 413, 452
Hanseatic League, the, 165
Harmodius, statue of, 13
Hatasu (Hatchepsu), Queen, temple of, at Thebes, 223
Hatch, Mr., on Septuagint, 199
Haussoullier, M., on Delphi, 379, 392, 393, 410
Havercamp, his *Josephus*, 508
Heathen Chinee, the, 294
Hebrew language, the, 526
Hecademus, 156
Hecalesia, Attic feast, 285
Hecatodorus, sculptor, 580
Hecyra, the, 132
Hegemon, 89, 90
Hegesander of Delphi, 145
Hegesias of Magnesia, orator, 338 *sq.*, 410
Helbon, 514
Heldreich, 146
Helepolis, machine of Demetrius Poliorketes, 105
Heliograph, invented by Polybius, 558
Heliopolis, 181, 182, 537
Helios, 101
Hellas, 82
Hellenedom, destroyed at Issus, 5
Hellenic idea of physical recreation, 30
Hellenion, the, at Naucratis, 271
Hellenism, its birth at Issus, 5; confusion attending its inception, 38; common dialect of, 111; religion of, 140; golden age of, 162 *sq.*; in Syria, 226; its effect upon literature of Alexandria, 303 *sq.*; a failure under Philadelphus, 307; a success under Seleucids, 307; a definition of, 352; its weak point, 354; its mercantile aspects, 355 *sq.*; its inner life, *temp.* Aratus, 397 *sq.*; its crisis, 420 *sq.*; its gradual subjection to Rome, 466 *sq.*, 591 *sq.*; its death-blow, 485; in Asia Minor

under Romans, 487 *sq.*; decay of, in Syria, 494 *sq.*; its Jewish development, 494, 502 *sq.*, 548 *sq.*; decay of, in Egypt, 532 *sq.*; causes of its decay, 570 *sq.*; international rights in, 582 *sq.*; arbitration and diplomacy in, 583 *sq.*; embassies in, 585 *sq.*; its later literature, 592 *sq.*; its importation to Rome, 597 *sq.*; its relation to imperialism and nationalism, 614 *sq.*
Hellenistic age, the, its modern spirit, 18
—— world, the, its divisions, 163 *sq.*
Hellenists, modern, their ignorance of condition of Greeks after Alexander's accession, 1 *sq.*
Hellespont, 40, 50, 471, 490; Greek cities on, restored to Egypt, 475 *sq.*
Hengstenberg, on bilingual inscriptions at Athens, 507
Hephaestion, general, 37, 42, 309, 364
—— grammarian, 269
Hephaestus, god, 470
Heracleia, in Pontus, 11, 155, 322, 356, 371, 373, 490
Heracleides, admiral of Philip V., 559
Heraclitus, philosopher, 149, 520
Heraeon, 580
Herakles, 23, 101, 602
—— bastard son of Alexander the Great, 14, 66, 68
Hermann's *Antiquities*, on Greek professional artists, 411
Hermeias, vizier of Antiochus III., 424 *sq.*, 449, 573
Hermesianax, elegies of, 243, 261 *sq.*; his longest fragment quoted, 625 *sq.*
Hermippus, flute-player, 604
Hermodorus, architect, 603
Hermopolis, 191
Hero, and Leander, story of, 256
—— mathematician, 545
Herodotus, 26, 34, 170, 304, 566; on tyrants, 6; on democracy, 12; on Macedonian royalty, 20; on story of Cypselus, 56; his history of Egypt, 178 *sq.*; on Hellenion at Naucratis, 182; on invasion of Egypt by Cambyses, 183; on position of women in Egypt, 186
Herods, the, 145, 517
Herondas, *Mimiambics* of, 243, 300 *sq.*, 312
Hesiod, ideal portraits of, 119; his *Works and Days*, 247, 303; the model of Alexandrian epic, 282
Ἑταῖροι, 'peers' of Macedonia, 23, 44
Hicks, Mr., on inscriptions of Priene, 631 *sq.*
Hiero II. of Syracuse, 297, 320, 367, 431
Hieronymus, of Cardia, 42, 46, 79, 230
Hindukush mountains, the, 53, 227
Hipparchus, 158
—— astronomer, 545; on *Phaenomena* of Aratus, 246
Hippodamos, architect of Piraeus, 329
History of Greek Literature (author's), referred to, 186, 197, 238, 254, 268, 285 *sq.*, 288, 295, 302, 545
Hitzig, on Lycian Patara, 515
Hody, on pseudo-Aristeas, 508
Hogarth, Mr. D. C., on divine honours of Alexander the Great, 13
—— painter, 285
Holland, 356
Holm, A., his *History of Greece*, 78, 163
Holophernes in Book of Judith, 496, 527
Holzinger, C. von, editor of Lycophron, 303
Homer, 64, 268, 401, 533, 592; his pictures of sovranty, 23; ideal portraits of, 119; his place in Greek literature, 281; reproduced by Virgil, 303; Alexandrine recension of, 543 *sq.*; Eratosthenes and Strabo on, 546
—— of Caria, tragic writer, 295
Horace, his choriambic metre, 270; his debts to Callimachus, 275

Horus, 189 *sq.*
Huet, the Jesuit, on monkish forgeries, 583
Humour, later Greek literature deficient in, 592 *sq.*
Hungarians, the, 616
Huns, invasion of, 169
Hydaspes, battle on, 50
Hylas, 295
Hymn, the, in Alexandrian literature, 271 *sq.*
Hypereides, orator, 5, 44, 84, 341, 410
Hyrcania, 227
Hyrcanian dogs, 218
Hyrcanus, son of Josephus, his adventurous career, 511 *sq.*; his palace, 502, 513 *sq.*

IALYSOS, 102, 117, 358
Iasos, 358, 563
Ibis, the, of Callimachus, 243, 259 *sq.*, 268, 284
Idyll, the, in Alexandrian literature, 282, 294 *sq.*, 296 *sq.*
Iliad, 101; revised by Aristotle, 26; Bankes fragment of, 543
Ilium, 479
—— New, 322
Illyria, 71
Illyrians, the, 580; allies of Demetrius II., 383; their war with Rome, 384, 604; their raid on Antigonus Doson, 387
Imperialism and Hellenism, 614 *sq.*
Incas of Peru, the, 112
India, 52, 176, 287, 308, 312, 344; wealth of, 4
Indus, the, 167, 225
Infants, exposure of, 572
International rights in Hellenism, 582 *sq.*
Introduction to the Revenue Papyrus (author's), referred to, 343
Iolchos, 291
Ion of Chios, 120
Ionia, 333, 496
Iphicrates, portraits of, 119
Ipsus, battle of, 40, 45, 46, 52, 53, 57, 67, 79, 327
Ireland, 608; illogical nature of Separatist tendencies in, 6; its social relations with England, 109
Irish exiles, compared to those from Athens, 82 *sq.*
—— language, the, decadence of, 342
Ironsides of Cromwell, 33
Isaiah, prophecy of, 537
Isis, 170, 348
Ismael, ex-Khedive of Egypt, 502
Isocrates, 340; on monarchy, 230
—— of Syria, 579 *sq.*
Issus, battle of, 27, 61, 567; the starting-point of Hellenism, 5
Ister (Danube), the, 287
Istria, 358
Italian Renaissance, the, men of, 122
Italy, 56, 312, 616; classical Renaissance in, 122, 240
Ithyphallus (Appendix A), 97

JACKSON, Mr., his *Dalmatia*, 358
Jason in *Argonautics*, 288 *sq.*
—— pseudo-high-priest at Jerusalem, 514 *sq.*
Jericho, 517
Jerusalem, 223, 504 *sq.*, 517, 536; gymnasium at, 514 *sq.*
Jews, the, 174, 421, 535, 615; settlements of, in Alexandria, 166, 176 *sq.*, 195, 312, 506 *sq.*, 516; influenced by Hellenism, 166; settlements of, in Fayyum, 196 *sq.*; sketch of their connexion with Hellenism, 494, 502 *sq.*, 548 *sq.*; protected by Alexander the Great, 504 *sq.*; their relations with Sparta and Pergamum, 515 *sq.*; their nationalist literature, 526 *sq.*; their relations with Ptolemy Philometor, 536 *sq.*; their privileges in the East, 549 *sq.*; Hellenistic tendencies of their religion and literature under later Ptolemies, 548 *sq.*; in Antioch, 53, 553 *sq.*
John Baptist, 145
—— of Jerusalem, 515
—— St., gospel of, 616

Joppa, 328
Jordan, river, 328, 510, 513, 567
Joseph, story of, 183
Josephus, Flav., historian, on Alexander's eastern campaigns, 5, 504, 506; on Jews in Fayyum, 196 *sq.*; on amusements of Philadelphus, 223, 273; on excesses of Antiochus Epiphanes, 500, 509; his sketches of the first three Ptolemies, 507 *sq.*; his story of Josephus, son of Tobias, 511 *sq.*; on palace of Hyrcanus, 513; on Greek names in Palestine, 514; on missive from Sparta to Onias, 515; on Jewish persecutions under Ptolemy Physcon, 521, 548 *sq.*; on Jews under Antiochus III., 522 *sq.*; on Jewish persecution by Antiochus IV., 523 *sq.*; on temple of Onias, 537
—— son of Tobias, story of, 511 *sq.*
Judaea, 431, 469, 536; Hellenism in, 502 *sq.*, 524; independence of, 553
Judas Maccabaeus, 474, 504, 525
Judith, Book of, 496, 527
Julian, the Apostate, on musical conservatoire at Alexandria, 406
Jupiter Ammon, 14, 107
Juvenal, on Syrian Hellenism, 226

Καιρός, statue of, 119 *sq.*
Karbina, 320
Karion, fort, 632 *sq.*
Karnak, 306; Pylon of Ptolemy III. at, 345
Kars, the defence of, 372
Καταπελταφεσία (artillery practice) of Greeks, 405
Kauaros, king of Galatians, 376, 380
Kaunos, 356
Kekulé, on Laocoon, 362
Kelebi (wine), 181
Keramic Gulf, the, 356
King, title of, in Hellenic world, 68
Kios, city, 371
Knaack, on literature of Alexandria, 239
Köhler, on stele at Pithom, 223, 308
Korupedion, battle of, 40, 50
Kos, 47, 99, 102, 260, 300, 305, 352, 358, 364, 575; victory of Antigonus Gonatas at, 232
Kotys, king of Thrace, 493
Kratesipolis, 75, 92
Krinagoras, ed. Rubensohn, 264, 284
Kynane, daughter of Philip II., 71, 74
Kynosarges at Athens, the, 408
Kyretiae, 474

LACHARES, 97
Laconia, 298, 302
Lagidae, dynasty of, 164, 307
Lake, Sir H., the late, 372
Lakydeion, the, at Athens, 334
Lakydes of the Academy, 334 *sq.*
Lamia, city, 72, 84
—— courtesan, 62, 96
Lamian war, the, 93
Lampsacus, decree from, 476
Land Question in third century B.C., 7
Lange, on *Wisdom of Solomon*, 551
Laocoon, the, 362 *sq.*, 415
Laodice, queen of Antiochus Theos, 332, 343 *sq.*
—— wife of Achaeus, 442 *sq.*
Laodicea, in Syria, 578 *sq.*
Larisa, its relations with Philip V., 451; its relations with Rome, 474
Lebedos, 47
Lehrs, on Homeric criticism, 545
Leiden, students at, 407
Leipzig, students at, 407
Lemnos, 49
Leocrates, 1
Leonidas, king of Sparta, opponent of Agis III., 316 *sq.*
Leonnatus, 38, 41, 72, 73
Leontium, mistress of Hermesianax, 261
Leontopolis, Jewish temple at, 537

Leosthenes, 4
Lepidus, M., pretended guardian of Ptolemy V., 532
Lepsius, discoverer of Canopus Inscription, 346 *sq.*
Leptines, murderer of Octavius, 578 *sq.*
Les Baux, rock palace of, 513
Lesbos, lyric poetry of, 269; inscription at, 344
Letronne, 306; on Rosetta stone, 471
Leuctra, battle of, 583
Levant, the, 305, 479
Libanius, 315
Library of Alexandria, 206, 209 *sq.*
Libya, 287, 435
Life of Descartes (author's), referred to, 142, 595
Limnaeus, 368
Lindos, 102, 358
Literature, nationalist, of Jews, 526 *sq.*
Livy, on battle of Magnesia, 468; on Q. Marcius Philippus, 478; on Antiochus Epiphanes, 498 *sq.*; on plunder of Syracuse and Ambracia by Romans, 601
Locrians of Opus, the, 370
Lolling, on decree of Lampsacus, 476; on a text from Larisa, 451
Lombard, the, 616
London, 618; first Exhibition at, 110; its social relations with Paris, 110; demotic papyri at, 186
Louis XIV., formalities of his household, 25; classical Renaissance under, 240
Louvre, the, 115; -papyrus, on smuggling at mouth of Nile, 213
Love-god, the Alexandrian, 270
Love-stories, their frequency in Alexandrian literature, 250, 253 *sq.*; their Persian origin, 254
Lucian, 593; his account of *Calumny* of Apelles, 218 *sq.*; on picture of Aetion, 363 *sq.*
Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, 154, 246
Ludwich, A., on Homeric criticism, 545
Lumbroso, Prof. G., on Letter of Aristeas, 198, 208, 508
Luxor, 192
Luzac, on Peripatetics, 533
Lycaonia, 490
Lyceum, at Athens, 161, 408
Lycia, 338
Lycian League, the, 365
Lycophron, 261; his *Casandreans* and *Alexandra*, 170, 242, 296, 302 *sq.*, 593
Lycopolis, 470
Lycortas, leader of Achaean League, 498
Lycurgus, king of Sparta, 315, 473, 564
—— orator, his extant oration, 1; portraits of, 119
Lydia, 475, 522
Lydiades, envoy to Rome, 483
—— tyrant of Megalopolis, 229, 386, 390
Lygdamis, satrap, 596
Lyric poetry of Alexandria, the, 268 *sq.*
Lysanias, 368
Lysias, orator, 341
Lysimacheia, 175, 322, 327; as a title for cities, 314
Lysimachus, king of Thrace, 41, 46, 47, 63, 76, 97, 104, 105, 111, 220, 327, 331, 335, 412, 437, 596, 632; extent of his power, 40; sketch of his career, 48 *sq.*; banishes philosophers, 144 *sq.*
—— the Acarnanian, 48
—— uncle of Ptolemy Philopator, 423
Lysippus, sculptor, 14, 35, 114, 118, 320, 359 *sq.*
Lysistratus, his innovations in bronze portraiture, 121

MACAULAY, style of, 341
Maccabees, the, Jewish leaders, 518, 525 *sq.*, 553
—— First Book of, 523 *sq.*, 527; on Alexander the Great, 69; on

Romans, 474 *sq.*, 542; on missive from Sparta to Onias, 515 *sq.*
Maccabees, Second Book of, 475, 508; on Greek settlements in Palestine, 510; on gymnasium at Jerusalem, 514 *sq.*; on Jewish persecutions by Antiochus IV., 523 *sq.*; its distortion of facts, 527
—— Third Book of, 421, 528, 549; on Ptolemy IV. at Jerusalem, 521; its distortion of facts, 527
Macedonia, 39, 40, 49, 59, 163; its regulation of Athenian politics, 82; its place in Hellenistic world, 164; under Antigonus Gonatas, 228 *sq.*; deportation of its chief men to Rome, 597, 601 *sq.*
Macedonian kings, the, their ambition to be regarded as real Greeks, 20; their relations to their nobles, 24; their polygamous tendencies, 25 *sq.*
—— war, the second, 466; the third, 466
Macedonians, position of, after death of Alexander, 2; their dislike of Greeks, 10; their relations to Greek liberty, 12 *sq.*; their analogy to the Russians, 21; their doubtful position as Greeks, 22; their conception of a sovran, 23 *sq.*; their idea of physical recreation, 31; their lack of genius for trade, 176; in Alexandria, 196; character of, 231; deportation to Italy, 485; their insurrections against Rome, 598 *sq.*
Machiavelli, compared to Polybius, 417
Μάχιμοι, Egyptian military caste, 183, 199
Machon, dramatist of Alexandria, 215
Maeandrius of Miletus, his *Histories*, 632 *sq.*
Magas, king of Cyrene, 273
—— brother of Ptolemy Philopator, 422 *sq.*
Magi, the, 52
Magna Graecia, 71, 313, 375, 602; anti-Pythagorean riots in, 583
Magnesia, battle of, 11, 428, 464, 466, 468, 491, 495, 500, 532, 535, 560, 585, 603, 606
Malay Archipelago, the, 356
Manetho, 198, 225, 304, 528, 529
Manlius Vulso, 452
Mantinea, 8, 370
Mantineans, the, as arbitrators, 583
Marburg, 147
Marcelli, the, 133
Marcian MS. of Lycophron, 303
Marcius, Q., 370
Marcus Aemilius, envoy to Philip V., 582
Mardonius, 596; encourages democracy, 12
Mareotis, Lake, 175
Margites, the, 268
Marmarica (Cyrene), 190, 192
Marseilles, 513
Marsyas, Egyptian general, 540
Maspero, M., on Egyptian art, 195
Massilia, 146, 476; ephebi at, 406
Mattathias, father of Judas Maccabaeus, 525
Mausollus, 103; satrap, 596
Mazaca, city of Cappadocia, 497
Mazzini, 205
MDI (*Mitth. d. arch. Inst.*), 97, 194, 336, 474, 476, 588
Medea in *Argonautics*, 288 *sq.*
Medeon, in Acarnania, 383
—— in Phocis, 313
Media, 53, 475, 504, 506, 522
Medius, 92
Megalopolis, 8, 98, 138, 313, 498, 588
Megara, 92, 147, 381
Megasthenes, on divine claims of Alexander the Great, 14
Meineke, his *History of Greek Comedy*, 126; his *Analecta Alexandrina*, 243, 261, 293
Melancomas of Ephesus, 439 *sq.*
Melantes, 158
Meleager, friend of Demetrius Soter, 612

...nnon, Persian admiral, 66, 103, 104
Memoirs of Aratus of Sicyon, 396, 566, 594
Memphis, 181, 182, 184 *sq.*, 188, 211, 434, 436, 470, 499, 542
Memphites, son of Ptolemy Physcon, 540
Menander, 155, 215, 411, 593; his style and influence, 125, 127, 131
Mendes, temple at, 305
Menedemos, philosopher, 156, 295
Menelaus in the *Iliad*, 23
—— brother of Onias, 524
Menes, 185
Menestheus, friend of Demetrius Soter, 612
Menippus of Gadara, 400
Mentor, Persian admiral, 103, 104
Menyllus of Alabanda, 85, 87, 612 *sq.*
Mercenaries, Achaean and Aetolian, 8; Greek, in Egypt, 178 *sq.*, 181 *sq.*; foreign, their effect on Greek warfare, 445 *sq.*
Meredith, Mr. George, his style, 285
Merkel, editor of Apollonius Rhodius, 286
Meroe, 222
Mesopotamia, 52, 177, 225, 352, 504
Messene, 8, 101, 298, 313, 567; its opposition to Achaean League, 481 *sq.*
Messeniaca, the, of Rhianus, 243, 293, 630 *sq.*
Messenians, the, 600
Metapontum, 156
Metellus Macedonicus, 600, 603, 607
Metrodorus of Athens, philosopher, 234, 605
Middle Ages, the, 18; Church of, 22; religious use of art in, 118
—— Comedy, the, 137
Miezi, 21
Miletus, 321, 333, 586; its war with Samos, 631
Mill, J. S., 159
Miller, on Ptolemais, 308
Milo, the athlete, 31
Milton, unreality of his *Comus* and *Lycidas*, 238
Mimnermus, 251, 282
Mithradates, king of Pontus, 368, 373, 444, 466
Mithradatic war, the, 555
Mnasiadas of Argos, 435
Mnemosyne, the, of Moero, 322
Modeïn, 525
Moeragenes, officer of Ptolemy Epiphanes, 458 *sq.*
Moero, her *Mnemosyne*, 322
Molon, satrap under Antiochus III., of Media, 424 *sq.*, 574
Molossians, the, 56
Molossus, dogs of, 218
Mommsen, on Seleucus Nicator, 52; his *History of Rome*, 163; on Roman commissioners in Greece, 479; on Jewish privileges at Alexandria, 549; on Scipionic circle, 605
Montenegro, 383
Moses, books of, 508
Mozart, 341
Müller, A., on Dionysiac artists, 411 sq.
Müller, C. (ed. *FHG* and of *GG*), on will of Alexander the Great, 103; on Dicaearchus, 128; on *ps.-Callisthenes*, 205; on genealogy of Ptolemies, 305; (in *GG*) on Hegesias, 342
—— K. O., 327; on earthquakes at Antioch, 554
Mummius, 607; destroys Corinth, 486, 555, 603
Munk, on Peripatetics, 533
Munychia, 84, 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 112, 409
Munychion (month), 94
Murray, his *Egypt*, 346
Museum at Alexandria, the, 206 *sq.*, 215; its Greek exclusiveness under Philadelphus, 307; under later Ptolemies, 543 *sq.*
—— British, the, 209
—— the, of Athens, 98, 156 *sq.*
—— title of, 156

Mycenae, 567; Treasury of Atreus at, 114; tombs at, plundered by mercenaries, 448
Myrtile, name of Olympias, 69
Mytilene, inscription at, on Aetolian League, 391 *sq.*

NABATHAEA, 514
Nabis, tyrant of Sparta, 477, 567
Nāke, on *Hecale* of Callimachus, 284
Naples, 611
Napoleon I., his despotism in Germany, 16; generals of, 73
—— III., 320
Narthakion, inscription of, 474
"National League," the, in Ireland, 481 *sq.*
Nationalism, and Hellenism, 614 *sq.*
Nature, in literature, 240 *sq.*
Naucratis, 172, 176, 182, 587; Hellenion at, 271
Naupactus, 451, 473
Naville, M., on stele of Pithom, 271, 308
Naxos, 631
Nearchus, 29
Nebtanit, 191
Nebuchadnezzar, 527
Necropolis, of Alexandria, 212
Nega-el-Fokanu, 346
Neith, the town of (Sais), 191
Neleus, 158
Nemean games, the, 412
Neo-Platonism, 551
Nero, 86
Nestor, 603
New Comedy, the, 80, 125 *sq.*, 314, 581, 595
—— Testament, the, 54; its Syrian Greek, 226
Nicaea, city of, 194
—— despot of Corinth, 229
Nicanor, friend of Demetrius Soter, 613
—— (officer of Casander), 87 *sq.*
—— Syrian general, 508
Nick of Time, statue of, 119 *sq.*
Nicolaus Damascenus, on claim of Jews to relationship with Grecks, 516
Nicomachus of Rhodes, 439 *sq.*
Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, 371 *sq.*, 379, 497
Nicomedia, 322, 327, 371, 497, 586
Nicon, kinsman of Agathocles, 463
Nicopolis, at Alexandria, 212
—— in Epirus, 598
Nicostratus, secretary of Agathocles, 458 *sq.*
Niddach (*diaspora*), the, 505
Niebuhr, on Athens under Alexander, 16; on position of Macedonian kings, 24; on oriental loyalty to Alexander the Great, 28; on Chremonidean war, 233
Nike, the, of Samothrace, 114
Nikephoria, at Pergamum, 490
Nikokles, tyrant, in Cyprus, 261
Nile, 553; Canopic mouth of, 172; its relations to prosperity of Egypt, 176; Pelusiac mouth of, 178, 181
Niobe, statue of, epigrams on, 263
Norman barons, the, 58
Novel, the, with a purpose, in Jewish literature, 551 *sq.*
Nubia, 176

OBADIAH, Book of, 515
Ochus, his conquest of Egypt, 184, 192
Octavius, Roman noble, murdered by Syrians, 479, 578, 582
Odyssey, the, 544; interpolated by Jews, 550
Oenanthe, mother of Ptolemy Philopator's mistress, 454, 460, 463
Old Comedy, the, 593
—— men, in politics, 4; in the New Comedy, 123, 129, 132 *sq.*
—— Testament, the, Hellenised by Jews, 551
Olympia, 83, 94, 101; assemblage of exiles at, 15 *sq.*; temple of Ptolemy Philadelphus at, 305
Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great, 30, 39, 45, 65 *sq.*, 69 *sq.*

Olympic games, 30 *sq.*; admission of Macedonian kings to, 20
Olympichus, 368
Olympiodorus, 97
Olympus, home of gods, 14
Onias, high-priest at Jerusalem, 514 *sq.*, 524
—— son of high-priest, temple of, 536, 549
Oratory, decay of, at Athens, 409 *sq.*
Orchestra, platform near the Agora at Athens, 13
Orchomenus, inscription at, 323; tombs of, plundered by mercenaries, 448
Oreus, 589
Orontes (Syrian), the, 46, 120
Orophernes, Cappadocian prince, 496, 527
Orpheus, 261
Orphic mysteries, the, 71
Osiris, 190, 348
Ostia, 613
Overbeck, his *Griechische Plastik*, 114 *sq.*, 310, 338, 362 *sq.*; his *Schriftquellen*, 219, 360, 415 *sq.*; on plunder of Syracuse by Rome, 601; on Greek art at Rome, 603
Ovid, his imitations of Callimachus, 253, 267, 275, 284; love-stories in, 256, 258
Oxford, University of, 208

PAGASAE, 314
Pages, royal, at Macedonian court, 24
Painting, in the Hellenistic world, 414 *sq.*; of Alexandrine period, 117 *sq.*
Palermo, 329
Palestine, 40, 174, 222, 328, 464, 499, 505, 528, 534; under Ptolemies, 507 *sq.*; Hellenism in, 510 *sq.*; Greek names in, 514
Palmyra, ruins of, 503, 554
Pamphylia, 307, 359
Panaetius, Stoic philosopher, 539 *sq.*, 561
Pancrates, despot of Cibyra, 576
Pancreon, 158
Panion, battle of, 499, 567
Pan-Ionic festival, the, 632
Papyri, classical texts in, 543 (*see* Petrie)
—— demotic, their revelations of social life in Egypt, 185 *sq.*
Papyrus, demotic, on Amasis, 181
Paradise Lost, the, 282
Paris, 177; its social relations with London, 110
Parmenides, philosopher, 251
Parmenio, 44
Parnassus, Mount, 7
Parthenius, his *Erotica* or collection of love-tales, 262
Parthenon, the, 62, 95, 115, 309, 402
Parthia, 53
Parthian Gates, the, 53; revolt, the, 334 *sq.*, 344
Parthians, 554, 615; their lapse from Hellenism, 520
Patara, in Lycia, 515
Pater, Mr. Walter, on *classical* and *romantic* literature, 240
Patrae, 92, 600; art of, 116
Patrokles (author), 33
Paul, St., 315; his Stoical training, 151; quotes *Phaenomena*, 278
Paullus Aemilius, 216, 477, 500, 556, 570, 603 *sq.*
Pauly-Wissowa (*Encyclopædia*), on literature of Alexandria, 239
Pausanias (antiquarian), 98; on Lysimachus, 49; on Pergamenes, 100; on Celtic invasion, 170; on tomb of Alexander the Great, 211; on epic of Rhianus, 293; on Lycophron, 302; on Sicyon, 323; on Attalids, 331; on Diogenes, governor of Athens, 409
—— the Spartan king, 22
Payni, Egyptian month, 217, 348
Pe and Tep, gods and cities of, 189 *sq.*
Pekin, 212
Pella in Macedonia, 232
—— on Jordan, 328
Peloponnesian war, the, 102

Peloponnesus, the, 85, 382 *sq.*, 568
Pelops, officer of Ptolemy Epiphanes, 454
Pelusium, 436
Peraea, the, 356
Perdikkas, 41, 42, 50, 51, 71, 72, 173 *sq.*; usurpation and death of, 38, 39
Pergamenes, the, 102; origin of, 100
Pergamum, 35, 75, 76, 100, 156, 168 *sq.*, 232, 312, 322, 327, 330, 345, 350, 355, 364, 448, 472, 487, 581, 583, 596, 597; its school of sculpture, 114, 116, 337 *sq.*, 361; a centre of Hellenism, 163; a second-rate Hellenistic power, 165, 331 *sq.*; traces of Celtic invasion at, 170; education of youth at, 408; dramatic corporation of, 412; favoured by Rome, 467; under Eumenes II., 490; its relations with Jews, 516; its school of Homeric criticism, 544; Founders' Feast at, 586
Periclean age, the, 18
Pericles, 102, 122, 216, 631
Peripatetics, the, 547; their biographical works, 533
Περίπολοι (patrols) at Athens, 402 *sq.*
Persaeus, governor of Corinth, 229, 382, 389
Persepolis, 345; wealth of, 2
Perseus, king of Macedon, 370, 560; his war with Rome, 466, 472, 475, 478, 484 *sq.*, 492, 500, 574 *sq.*, 584; his son, 601
Persia, 13, 39, 84, 111; king of, 22; desert of, 53; Jews in, 505 *sq.*
Persian wealth, effects of its influx into Greece, 4 *sq.*, 112 *sq.*; kings, their mild government of Asia Minor, 10; barons, 15
Persians, the, 272; their loyalty to Alexander the Great, 28
Peter the Great, compared to Philip II. of Macedon, 21
Petra, ruins of, 503
Petrie, Mr. W. F., his discoveries at Defenneh, 178 *sq.*; on Naucratis, 182; on Hellenion of Naucratis, 271
—— papyri, 346, 362; their disclosures, 198 *sq.*; on season of vintage in Egypt, 217; the Greek language in, 226
Peukestas, 35, 41, 49, 52
Pfleiderer, Professor, on Heraclitus, 520
Phaedra, 289
Phaenomena of Aratus, 242, 245 *sq.*, 265, 300, 304; its practical object, 247 *sq.*; its prologue, 249 *sq.*, 278, 622
Phalaris of Agrigentum, 171
Phanocles, elegies of, 243, 261, 622 *sq.*
Pharaoh-Hophra (Apries), 179 *sq.*
Pharaoh-Necho, canal of, 176
Pharaohs, the, 307
Pharisees, the, 517 *sq.*
Pharnaces of Pontus, 491
Pharsalia, battle of, 555
Pharuges, in Phocis, 89
Phaselis, 576
Pheneus, 603
Phidias, 79, 114
Phila, wife of Demetrius Poliorketes, 63, 76 *sq.*
Philae, temple at, 305, 346
Philammon, governor of Cyrene, 454, 463 *sq.*
Philemon, 125
Philenium, courtesan in *Asinaria*, 132
Philetaeria, fort, 332
Philetaerus, governor of Pergamum, 331 *sq.*
Philetas of Alexandria, 215, 243, 260
Philip II. of Macedon, 5, 12, 32, 42, 44, 81, 86, 232, 473; his letter in works of Demosthenes, 20; his ambition to become a naturalised Greek, 20 *sq.*; compared to Peter the Great, 21; his second marriage, 26; his daughters, 71 *sq.*
—— V., king of Macedon,

22, 302, 370, 381, 385, 409, 413, 420, 445, 454, 467, 475, 480, 582, 584; treaty with Hannibal, 413, 452; character of, 428; seizes Thermus, 447 *sq.*; his ministers, 449 *sq.*; his war with Aetolians, 452; his attack on Egypt, 464; defeat at Cynoscephalae, 466, 471 *sq.*, 606; Polybius on, 559 *sq.*, 583; besieges Abydos, 577 *sq.*; his destruction of works of art, 580; his discussion with Flamininus, 584, 587
Philip Arridaeus, 38 *sq.*, 65, 74 *sq.*, 86, 189
Philippi, battle of, 555
Philippides, 95
Philippus, Q. Marcius, 478, 492
Philiscus of Corcyra, tragic writer, 295
—— priest of Dionysus at Alexandria, 219
Philo, kinsman of Agathocles, 460, 463
—— mathematician, 545
—— of Byzantium, 360
—— of Cnossus, 435
—— philosopher, 506, 530, 551
Philochorus, historian, 235
Philocles, king of Sidon, 115, 309
Philomedes, 88
Philophron of Rhodes, 492
Philopoemen, 395, 404, 432, 481, 533, 556; his character, 473 *sq.*
Philosophers, embassy of, to Rome, 143
Philosophy, schools of, their sudden importance at Athens after Alexander's death, 4
Philostratus, his tract on gymnastics, 406
Philotera, sister of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 272
Philoxenus, musician, 418
Phocaea, 476
Phocians, the, 8
Phocion, 4, 85 *sq.*, 142, 566; fall of, 88 *sq.*; his house at Athens, 113; his public spirit, 138 *sq.*
Phocis, 298, 323, 600, 607; inscription at, 156
Phoenice, in Epirus, 383
Phoenicia, 51, 101, 358, 385, 534
Phoenicians, the, 505
Phormio, 79
Phoxidas of Melita, 434 *sq.*
Phrygia, 41, 46, 490, 522
Phylarchus, historian, 79, 235, 396; on Byzantines, 372
Piedmontese, 616
Pigmies, the, 2
Pinaros, river, 567
Pindar, 101, 244, 269, 274, 326, 337, 548
Piraeus, the, 62, 88, 98, 409, 590
Pirates, 11; put down by Rhodes, 355, 357
Pirke-aboth, the, 615
Pisidia, 490
Pithom, stele of, 192, 223, 271, 308; temple at, 305
Plato, 123, 131, 139, 141 *sq.*, 304, 548, 564, 581; his methods, 148; his republic, 151; his museum, 156 *sq.*; on monarchy, 230; on romantic affection for youths among Greeks, 261; *Republic* of, 280; on *ephebi*, 403
Plautus, 80, 113, 128, 605
Pleuron, art of, 116
Pliny, 575; on portrait of Antigonus Monophthalmos by Apelles, 119; on Colossus of Rhodes, 360; on Hellenistic school of painting, 416; on Roman adoption of Greek art, 603; on Metrodorus, 605
Plutarch, 322, 547, 582, 593; on Alexander's contempt for Spartans, 3; on deification of Alexander, 14; his life of Alexander, 19; on mannerisms of Alexander, 20; on luxuriousness of Alexander, 27 *sq.*; on death of Alexander, 29; on a saying of Seleucus, 30; his *Life of Eumenes*, 42 *sq.*, 332; on Antipater, 44; on Antig. Monophth., 47; on Lysimachus, 49, 145; his *Life of Pyrrhus*, 56 *sq.*, 446; his *Life of*

Demetrius Poliorketes, 61 *sq.*; on bastard Herakles, 66; on Olympias, 69 *sq.*; on Eurydike, 75; on Attalus II., 76; deficiency of his *Lives*, 79; on rescript of Polyperchon, 86 *sq.*; on occupation of Athens by Polyperchon, 88 *sq.*; on occupation of Athens by Dem. Poliorketes, 91 *sq.*; on house of Phocion, 114; on Apelles, 117; on Timoleon, 120; on murder of Clitus, 141 *sq.*; on Xenocrates, 142; on Zeno, 152; on tyrant Apollodorus, 170; on Zeus Hades, 201 *sq.*; on capture of Acrocorinthus by Antigonus Gonatas, 238 *sq.*; on monarchy, 230; his *Life of Aratus*, 233, 323 *sq.*, 370, 382, 396, 409, 594; on female purity in Alexandrine age, 258; quotes Callimachus, 276; his abrupt method of opening dialogues, 294; his *Life of Agis*, 316 *sq.*; on respect given to Spartans, 318; his *Life of Dion*, 325; on banditti in Greece, 392; his *Life of Cleomenes*, 396, 412, 421 *sq.*; his partiality, 396; on Apelles, 414; on character of Philip V., 428; on Hellenism of Egyptian monarchs, 468; his *Life of T. Quinctius (Flamininus)*, 476 *sq.*; on Antiochus III. as 'liberator' of Greeks, 481; on Aristomenes, minister of Ptolemy V., 534; on boundary dispute between Samos and Priene, 631

Polemo, 398

Poles, the, 616

Polyaratus of Rhodes, cowardice of, 575 *sq.*

Polybius, 26, 79, 86, 163, 196, 199, 224, 235, 381, 618; on rise of Achaean League, 9, 393 *sq.*; on doubtful position of Macedonians as Hellenes, 22; on Zeno the historian, 103; on Timaeus, 126; on exposure of children, 130; on Demetrius Phalereus, 161, 410; on riot at Alexandria, 212; on social life in Syria, 227; on practical astronomy, 251; on Elis, 330; on acquisition of Aegina by Attalus I., 336; on Roman relations with Rhodes, 359; on earthquake at Rhodes, 366 *sq.*; on war of Rhodes with Byzantium, 373 *sq.*; commencing point of his work, 388, 420; on Aetolian League, 392 *sq.*; his partiality, 396; on Greek public education, 407; on treaty of Philip V. with Hannibal, 413, 452; on the moral influence of art, 416 *sq.*; compared to Machiavelli, 417, 562, 570; on death of Hermeias, 424 *sq.*; on character of Philip V., 428; on capture of Tarentum by Hannibal, 433; on relations between Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus the Great, 433 *sq.*; on betrayal of Achaeus, 438 *sq.*; on capture of Thermus by Philip V., 447 *sq.*; on court favourites, 450 *sq.*; on first connexion between Eastern and Western politics, 451; on Ptolemy Epiphanes, 453 *sq.*, 533 *sq.*; value of his evidence on Roman wars with Hellenism, 467; on proclamation of Ptolemy Epiphanes, 469; on protest of Lampsacus, 476; as a politician, 483 *sq.*; on embassies of Eumenes II. and Rhodians to Rome, 488 *sq.*; on royal hostages at Rome, 495; on Antiochus Epiphanes, 498 *sq.*; on Egyptian wars of Antiochus Epiphanes, 499; on festival of Antiochus Epiphanes at Daphne, 500 *sq.*; on Jews in Egypt, 507; on Ptolemy Philometor, 535, 538; visits Alexandria, 541 *sq.*, 556; his silence with reference to Alexandrian Jews, 549; sketch of himself and his age, 555 *sq.*; his aristocratic tone, 557; inventor of heliograph, 558; his military ability, 558; influenced by Stoicism, 561

sq.; on Roman morality, 562 *sq.*; his general politics, 564 *sq.*; on Olympic games, 569; on depopulation of Greece, 570 *sq.*; on suicide, 574 *sq.*; on arbitration and diplomacy, 583 *sq.*; on insurrections of Macedonians against Rome, 598; on fate of Greece, 599 *sq.*; on L. Anicius, 603 *sq.*; on Postumius Albinus, 607; on quarrel between Prusias and Attalus, 609; on Roman policy in East, 610; on escape of Demetrius Soter from Rome, 611 *sq.*
Polycrates of Alexandria, 460, 469, 534
—— of Argos, 435
Polyperchon, 39, 45, 65, 71, 75, 88 *sq.*, 137; rescript of, 86 *sq.*
Polythrus of Teos, 405
Polyxena, name of Olympias, 69
Pompeii, wall-decoration of, 122
Pompey, his settlement of the East, 494
Pontus, 137, 227, 357, 487
Pope, his *Essay on Man*, 128, 268
Popilius Laenas, 499, 576, 582, 587
Porphyry, 145
Poseidon, 101
—— the Isthmian, 603
Posen, Poles of, 616
Posidippus, epigram of, on statue of Καιρός, 120
Power, the balance of, in Hellenistic world, 164
Praxiteles, 115
Pre-Raphaelitism, 122
Priam, 603
Priene, 370, 496; its boundary dispute with Samos, 631 *sq.*
Priests under Ptolemy I., 200 *sq.*
Princesses, the, of period of Diadochi, their character, 69 *sq.*
Proclamations of freedom, 86
Prolegomena to Ancient History (author's) referred to, 201
Propertius, poetry of, 259
Propontis, the, 220, 352, 385, 391
Protagoras, 144
Protogenes, 63, 117, 363; his *Ialysos*, 415
Provençal, the, 616
Provence, 513
Proverbs, Book of, 518
Proxenus, historian, 79
Prusias, king of Bithynia, 327, 368, 378 *sq.*, 491, 562, 586, 589, 609
Psalms, Book of, on *Niddach*, 505
Psammetichus I., 178 *sq.*
—— II., 179
Pshent, 307
Ptah, god, 190, 470
Ptolemaea, the, at Delos, 174
Ptolemaeion, the, at Athens, 409
Ptolemais (in Syria), 328, 510
—— in Upper Egypt, 194, 308
Ptolemy I. (*Soter*), 17, 38, 39, 41, 46, 48, 50, 54, 57, 61, 64, 65, 67, 68, 72, 76, 93, 104, 114, 160, 165, 196, 304, 309, 357; his proclamation of Greek freedom, 87; his alliance with Rhodes, 104 *sq.*, 174; portraits of, 119; his genius and policy, 173 *sq.*, 200 *sq.*; declaration of, 188 *sq.*; his influence on Hellenism, 204 *sq.*; his *Memoirs* of Alexander, 205; his foundation of Museum, 206 *sq.*; Josephus on, 507
Ptolemy II. (*Philadelphus*), 35, 41, 59, 168, 182, 206, 211, 266, 333 *sq.*, 345, 357, 525; his accession and career, 214 *sq.*; his connexion with Museum, 215; his taste for natural history, 215, 223, 304; his coronation festival, 215 *sq.*; his foreign policy, 221 *sq.*; his embassy to Rome, 221; his moral failings, 222 *sq.*; his devotion to the Greek world, 271 *sq.*; his neglect of policy of fusion, 305 *sq.*; his gymnasia at Athens, 409; sketch of, by Josephus, 508 *sq.*; his gifts to temple at Jerusalem, 508 *sq.*
—— III. (*Euergetes I.*), 272, 306, 335, 365, 388; marries Berenike, 342 *sq.*; his campaign

in Asia, 344 *sq.*, 356; encourages reaction against Hellenism, 345 *sq.*; his relations with priests, 347 *sq.*; his decaying vigour, 385, 421 *sq.*, 511
Ptolemy IV. (*Philopator*), 174, 187, 201, 370, 420 *sq.*, 467, 527, 532, 549, 587; his relations with Antiochus the Great, 433 *sq.*; death, 453; character of, 532 *sq.*
—— V. (*Epiphanes*), 202, 421, 467; accession of, 453 *sq.*, 549; proclamation of, 469 *sq.*; character of, 532 *sq.*
—— VII. (*Philometor*), 197, 533 *sq.*, 551, 560, 586 *sq.*, 612; his relations with Jews, 536 *sq.*
—— VIII. (*Philopator Neos*), 538
—— IX. Physcon (*Euergetes II.*), 220, 521, 535, 548, 556; sketch of, 538 *sq.*, 612
—— XIII. (Auletes), 346
—— Keraunos, 40, 59, 77, 214, 220, 331 *sq.*
—— rhetor of Alexandria, 586
—— son of Agesarchus, 455
—— son of Sosibius, 454
—— Sympetesis, 224
Punic war, the first, 221; the second, 133, 387, 421, 452
Puteoli, a port for Egyptian trade, 221
Pydna, battle of, 466, 474, 491 *sq.*, 499 *sq.*, 535, 574, 584, 603
Pyrrho, philosopher, 140, 155, 156, 266, 591
Pyrrhonism, 399
Pyrrhus (of Epirus), 41, 48, 52, 55 *sq.*, 76, 97, 99, 221, 228, 320, 382, 383, 388, 446
Pythagoras, 143, 156, 304
Pythaules, the, in Greek comedy, 413
Pytheas, 14
Pythian games, the, 412

QUEEN'S Colleges in Ireland, 210
Quest of the Golden Fleece, 286

RACINE, artificiality of, 239; his *Hippolytus* (in *Phèdre*), 250
Ra-Harmachis, 192
Rainer Papyri, the, on *Hecale* of Callimachus, 285
Rakotis, 188, 189
Rambles and Studies in Greece referred to, 319, 410, 419
Ramessids, dynasty of, 185
Raphael, 118
Raphia, battle of, 199, 366, 421, 521
Realism, in Alexandrine literature, 259 *sq.*
Red Sea, the, 203, 308, 326, 344, 357
Regulus, 344
Religion, the, of later Hellenism, 140 *sq.*
Rescript of Alexander the Great, ordering restoration of Greek exiles, 13 *sq.*, 83
Resting Satyr, the, of Protogenes, 117
Revenue Papyrus, 272, 521; on state monopoly of oil in Egypt, 213
Revillout, E., on Egyptian artists, 180; on Amasis, 181; on Egyptian military caste, 183; his investigations of demotic papyri, 185 *sq.*; on Rosetta stone, 471; on Ptolemy Philopator, 521; on Egyptian nationalism, 527 *sq.*
Rhianus, epic of, 243, 293; epigrams of, 264, 293, 630 *sq.*
Rhodes, 63, 99, 117, 322, 336, 345, 350, 432, 487, 498, 508, 543, 560, 567, 575 *sq.*, 609; forms alliance with Casander, 39; sketch of its progress and power, 100 *sq.*; besieged by Demetrius Poliorketes, 104 *sq.*; its school of sculpture, 114; the Dionysion of, 117; colossus of, 121; a centre of Hellenism, 163; its alliance with Ptolemy I., 174; temple of Ptolemy II. at, 305; account of, from death of Alexander the Great, 355 *sq.*; its commercial federation, 356 *sq.*; destroys pirates, 355, 357; compared to Venice, 358; its rela-

tions with Rome, 359; its art, 359 *sq.*; as an arbitrator, 365 *sq.*; floods at, 365; earthquake at, 365 *sq.*; its commercial war with Byzantium, 373 *sq.*; favoured by Rome, 467, 488 *sq.*; its embassy to Rome, 488 *sq.*; defended at Rome by Astymedes, 584 *sq.*; rhetoric of, 592; its arbitration on boundary dispute between Priene and Samos, 632 *sq.*
Rhodians, the, 464
Roman Empire, the, 54
—— ladies, the, 605
—— poetry, style of its earlier development, 122
Romans, the, 22, 53, 524; their intercourse with Pyrrhus, 56 *sq.*; their *aurum coronarium*, 220; their relations with Ptolemy Philadelphus, 221; their war with Pyrrhus, 320; their relations with Rhodes, 359; their war with Illyrian pirates, 384; war with Antiochus the Great, 427 *sq.*, 466; their first connexion with Eastern politics, 451 *sq.*; war with Perseus, 466, 472, 475, 478, 484 *sq.*; their gradual subjection of Hellenism, 466 *sq.*; sketch of, in first book of *Maccabees*, 474 *sq.*; conduct of their generals in Greece, 476 *sq.*; claims to Trojan descent, 477, 479 *sq.*; their weakness in governing Greece, 479 *sq.*, 608 *sq.*; their settlement of Greece, 485; their policy towards Eumenes II., 493; their influence in Syria, 495 *sq.*; become guardians of Ptolemy V., 532; their policy of dissension, 536; their government of East in age of Polybius, 555 *sq.*; their morality, 562 *sq.*; their bad manners, 582, 603 *sq.*; as arbitrators, 583 *sq.*; their lack of humour, 593; their importation of Hellenism, 597 *sq.*; their deterioration under Greek influences, 606 *sq.*; their commissions in the East, 608 *sq.*
Rome, 576, 595; embassy of Greek philosophers to, 143, 610; Eastern princes resident at, 495 *sq.*; importation of Hellenism to, 597 *sq.*; "Greek colony" at, 610 *sq.*; its imperialism, 617
Rosellini, 345
Rosetta stone, the, 94, 188, 198 *sq.*, 204, 347, 349; on Egyptian military caste, 183; containing proclamation of Ptolemy Epiphanes, 468 *sq.*
Roxane, wife of Alexander the Great, 30, 38, 66, 70, 72, 73, 363
Royalty, un-Hellenic nature of, 20
Royston, Lord, translator of Lycophron, 303
Rubensohn, his *Krinagoras*, 264, 284
Rugby, in Leicestershire, 329
Russians, the, their analogy to Macedonians, 21
Ryparographi (realistic painters), 416

SA, 191
Saalfeld, on educated Romans *temp.* Scipio Africanus, 476
Sadducees, the, 517 *sq.*, 525
Sahara, the, 110
Sais, 191
Salamis, 88, 409
Salaries, the, of Greek dramatic artists, 413
Samos, 358, 370; its boundary dispute with Priene, 631 *sq.*
Samothrace, 49, 535, 560; temple of Arsinoe Philadelphus at, 305; *Nike* of, 114, 310
Samus, son of Chrysogonus, 448
San, inscription of (*see* Canopus Inscription)
Sappho, ideal portraits of, 119; lyric poetry of, 269
Sarapis, 201
Sardanapalus, 220
Sardis, 72, 73, 333, 343, 426, 438 *sq.*
Sarpedon, 101
Satyrus, 305

Scarpheia, battle of, 607
Schliemann, Dr., his excavations of Greek tombs, 449
Schmidt, M., on pseudo-Aristeas, 508
Schreiber, Th., on debts of Rome to Alexandria, 121 ; on the fine arts at Alexandria, 350
Schürer, on Syrian ruins, 502 *sq.*; on Greek settlements in Palestine, 510 ; on Jewish privileges, 550
Science, exact, under later Ptolemies, 545 *sq.*
Scipio Africanus, 452, 476 *sq.*, 570, 606
—— Aemilianus, 477 ; his embassy to Egypt, 539 *sq.* ; his friendship with Polybius, 556 *sq.*, 605
Scipionic circle, the, 605
Scopas, Aetolian, 455, 469, 567, 580, 582
—— sculptor, 323
Scotch, the, their social relations with England, 109
Scribes, the (Jewish), 517
Sculpture, the, of Alexandrine period, 114 *sq.*
Scythopolis (Bethshan), 328, 501
Sebennys, 191
Seleucia, on Orontes, 227, 328, 345, 424, 436 *sq.*
—— on Tigris, 52, 126, 226, 507, 553
Seleucids, the, 164, 203, 327 ; Hellenism under, 307
Seleucus I. (*Nicator*), 30, 39 *sq.*, 41, 63, 68, 75, 77, 226, 327, 331 *sq.*, 437, 509, 554, 596 ; sketch of his career, 50 *sq.*
—— II. (*Callinicus*), 336, 345, 350, 356, 365, 367, 553
—— III. (*Philopator*), 423, 477, 495, 523, 589
Sellasia, battle of, 387, 422, 481, 567
Seneca, on Library of Alexandria, 210
Separatist school of Homeric criticism, the, 544
Separatist spirit, in ancient and modern times, 6
Septuagint, the (LXX.), 53, 166, 197 *sq.*, 225 *sq.*, 304, 508, 510, 530, 548
Sesostris, 304
Sextus Empiricus, 266
Shah-name, the epic of, 53
Shakespeare, 27 ; source of his love-stories, 256 *sq.*
Shanghai, 182
Shelley, 57
Shuckburgh, Mr., his translation of Polybius, 366 *sq.*, 453
Sibylline oracles, forged by Jews, 550
Sicilian, the, 616
Sicily, 298, 313, 393
Sicyon, 11, 17, 76, 98, 138, 310, 390 ; artists of, 216 ; (New), 322 ; sketch of, 323 *sq.*
Sidon, 227 ; tomb of king of, 115 *sq.*, 163, 308 *sq.*
Silloi, the, of Timon of Phlius, 242, 265 *sq.*
Simonides, epigrams of, 263
Sinope, 201, 373
Sion, Mount, 537
Sipylos, Mount, 338
Smyrna, 111, 321, 476 ; wealth of, 11 ; restored by Antigonus Monophthalmos, 47
—— New, 322, 350
Social Life in Greece referred to, 56, 261, 446, 573, 581 *sq.*
Socotora, island, 326
Socrates, 120, 141, 144
—— of Boeotia, 434
Sogdiana, 15, 34, 50, 52, 352
Solomon, 197, 504, 517
—— *Wisdom of*, 518 *sq.*, 525 *sq.*, 551
Solon, 85, 157 ; ideal portraits of, 119 ; elegiac poetry of, 251
—— of Plataea, 89
Sonne, E., on international arbitration, 370
Sophagasenus, king of the Indians, 427
Sophocles (tragic poet), modern editions of, 124 ; on women in

Egypt, 186; his tragic diction, 302; on Laocoon, 362; interpolated by Jews, 550
Sophocles (politician), proposer of law against philosophers, 143 *sq.*
Sophron, commandant of Ephesus, 344
—— of Syracuse, 238; mimes of, 299 *sq.*, 312, 321
Sosibius, minister of Ptolemy Philopator, 422 *sq.*, 433 *sq.*, 449, 453 *sq.*
—— the younger, 462
Sosiphanes of Syracuse, tragic writer, 295
Sosos of Pergamum, painter, 416
Sostratus, architect of Pharos at Alexandria, 222
—— sculptor, 580
Sotades, his poetry and metre, 267
Soteria, the, Bithynian festival, 379
South Americans, the, 616
Spain, 384, 475, 572; how affected by Peruvian wealth, 112
Spaniards, the, 572
Sparta, 2, 3, 8, 15, 32, 59, 99, 102, 133, 453, 564, 583; policy of, towards Alexander and his successors, 3; its political system, 3; its obstinate resistance to Alexander, 15; kings of, 22 *sq.*; its position in third century B.C., 315 *sq.*; a democratic monarchy under Cleomenes III., 386 *sq.*; why so long uncaptured, 473 *sq.*; its opposition to Achaean League, 481 *sq.*; missive from, to Jerusalem, 515 *sq.*
Spartans, the, their Conservatism, 319
Spencer, Earl, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 6
Speusippus, 157
Sphaerus, Stoic, 230, 390, 395, 533
Sphinx, the, 64
Spindle, poem to a, 270
Spitamenes of Sogdiana, 50
Spohr, 341
Stark, Bern., his *Gaza*, 510, 511, 516
Statira, 38
Stesichorus, 269; his *Kalyke*, 254
Stilpo, 92 *sq.*
Stiris, in Phocis, 313
Stoa, the, 138
Stobaeus, 230, 243, 267
Stoicism, its justification of suicide, 574
Stoics, the, 58, 148 *sq.*, 519, 547, 591
Strabo, 146; on visit of Alexander the Great to Ammon, 13 *sq.*; on Athens under Casander, 16; on character of Alexander the Great, 33 *sq.*; on restoration of Ephesus by Lysimachus, 47, 49; on Antiochus I., 53; on Uranopolis, 64; on carving of Mount Athos, 121; on climate of Alexandria, 175; on Museum of Alexandria, 208, 213; on palaces of Ptolemies, 223; on Ptolemais, 308; on Tarentum, 320; on tyrants, 325; on Attalids, 331; on Hegesias, 341; on Lycian League, 365; on tyrants of Sicyon, 389; on dramatic corporation of Teos, 412; on moral influence of art, 419; on Ptolemy Philopator, 421; on Acarnanians, 479; on Mazaca, 497; his estimate of Homer, 546; on enlargement of Antioch, 553; on Cappadocians, 598
Strato (tutor of second Ptolemy), 215
Stratocles, 62, 94
Stratonike, name of Olympias, 69
—— wife of Eumenes II., 76
—— wife of Seleucus Nicator, 51, 75
Suetonius, on Emperor Claudius, 477
Suez Canal, the, 377
Suicide, justified by Stoics, 574; its prevalence in Hellenism, 574 *sq.*
Suidas, on Antipater, 44; on Aratus of Soli, 245
Sulpicius, Publius, on capture of Aegina, 583
Sunion, 409
Susa, 13, 345; wealth of, 2

Susemihl, 267, on literature of Alexandria, 239, 283; on Aratus of Soli, 245, 251; on Hermesianax, 261
Swinburne, Mr., his extravagant criticism, 281
Swiss, the, as international arbiters, 9, 583
Sybaris, 320
Symonds, Mr. J. Addington, on *Anthology*, 264
Syracuse, 141, 313, 367, 371; in third century B.C., 319 *sq.*; theatre at, 410; plundered by Rome, 600 *sq.*
Syria, 174, 222, 388, 487, 588, 612; Hellenic culture in, 53 *sq.*, 164; under the Seleucidae, 224 *sq.*; under Antiochus III., 423 *sq.*; its estrangement from Hellenism, 467 *sq.*, 494 *sq.*; relations with Rome, 495 *sq.*; ruins in, 502 *sq.*
Syrian Hellenism, 226
Syrian war, the third, 423, 433
Syrians, their lapse from Hellenism, 520

TACITUS, 354; on Zeus Hades, 201 *sq.*
Taenarus, Cape, 85
Tahpahnes (Defenneh or Daphnae), discoveries of Mr. Petrie at, 178 *sq.*
Talmud, the, 615
Tanis, inscription of (*see* Canopus Inscription), 178, 188, 469
Tarentum, 371, 476; in third century B.C., 319 *sq.*
Tarsus, 543, 592; *ephebi* at, 406
Tartar and Russian, analogy to Macedonian culture, 21
Tauriskos of Tralles, 363
Taurus, the, 53, 336, 427
Taygetus, Mount, 32
Tegea, 8; inscriptions at, 491, 498, 516
Teians, the, 15
Telchines, the, 101
Teleas of Magnesia, 426 *sq.*
Telephus of Mysia, 100, 491
Teles, cynic philosopher, 400
Telesphorus, 49
Temnos, Aeolic dialect at, 312, 342
Tenea, near Corinth, 480
Tenedos, 480
Teniers, 285
Tennyson, his use of dialect, 270; his *Idylls of the King*, 282 *sq.*
Tenos, 174
Teos, 47, 412; inscription at, 404 *sq.*, 493
Terence, 125, 128, 614; his *Hecyra*, 605
Teuta, queen of Illyrium, 383 *sq.*, 582
Texts, classical, Alexandrine recension of, 543 *sq.*
Thais, the, of Menander, 132
Thapsus, desert of, 53
Thebans, the, 82, 583
Thebes (Boeotian), 3, 5, 20, 92, 97, 313, 389, 475, 607; restored by Casander, 98, 322 *sq.*; social life at, 110, 133, 137 *sq.*
—— (Egyptian), 182, 185, 188, 542
Theocritus, 197, 260, 262, 285, 350, 364; idylls of, 237, 275, 282, 294 *sq.*, 296 *sq.*; their artificiality, 237 *sq.*, 240; romanticism of, 242; his epigrams, 264; his lyric poems, 270; his hymns, 271, 276; sketch of Idylls xxv. and xxiv., 294 *sq.*; his encomium of Ptolemy II., 298, 304; his *Adoniazusae*, 285, 299; on female life in Alexandria, 312; on Dorians of Syracuse, 321; his pictures of country life, 352 *sq.*
Theodorus, flute-player, 604
Theodotus, general of Antiochus the Great, 436
Theognis, elegiac poetry of, 251
Theon of Samos, 117
Theophrastus, 28, 143, 155, 160; *Characters* of, 121, 127 *sq.*; his *Tract on Piety*, 145; his will, 158 *sq.*; *Diosemeia* of, 245
Theopompus, flute-player, 604
—— historian, 235, 563, 633

Theori, the, of Athens, 94
Θεραπεία, household of Macedonian kings, 25
Thermus, capital of Aetolian League, 392, 473; seized by Philip V., 446 *sq.*
Thespiae, 314; art of, 116
Thessalians, the, 449
Thessalonica, city of, 71
Thessalonike, daughter of Philip II., 71
Thessaly, 480
Thiersch, on Athens under Alexander, 16
Thoas of Rhodes, 575 *sq.*
Thompson, Mr. D'Arcy, his *Catalogue of Greek Birds*, 246
Thrace, 40, 49, 65, 85, 357
Thracians, the, 322
Thucydides, 34, 83, 566; defects of his history, 79; modern editions of, 124; on war between Miletos and Samos, 631
Tiber, the, 612
Tigris, the, 307
Timaeus, historian, 126, 235, 568
Timoleon, compared to Garibaldi, 120
Timon of Phlius, the Sillograph, 140, 155, 242, 265 *sq.*
Timotheus, Eumolpid, 202
—— musician, 418
—— Athenian general, portraits of, 119
Tiresias, 275
Titles, prolific use of royal, by Egyptians, 193
Tlepolemus, governor of Pelusium, 456 *sq.*, 586
—— Homeric hero, 101
Tomb of king of Sidon at Constantinople, 115 *sq.*, 163, 308 *sq.*
Toro Farnese, the, 361, 362 *sq.*
Torr, Mr. Cecil, his *Rhodes in Ancient Times*, 355, 369
Torture, use of, during decay of Hellenism, 573 *sq.*
Tothmes III., temple of, at Wadi Halfa, 179
Tragedy, in literature of Alexandria, 295 *sq.*
Trebizond (Batoum), 357
Trierarchy, at Athens, 403
Trinity College, Dublin, compared to Royal University of Alexandria, 210
Triopian promontory, the, 102, 275
Triparadeisus, treaty of, 45, 50, 69, 72
Triptolemus, 41
Troad, the, 101, 305
Trojans, the, 101
Tryphon, 539
Turin, demotic papyri at, 186
Turks, the, their invasion of Europe, 169
Two Sicilies, the, 58
Tybi, Egyptian month, 347
Tylis, 376, 380
Tyre, 203, 227, 612; siege of, 99, 103
Tyrtaeus, elegiac poetry of, 251

UMBRIA, 602
Uraeus, 307
Uranopolis, 64

VAN DALE, on pseudo-Aristeas, 508
Varro, 400; his translations from Aratus of Soli, 245
Vatican, the, 114, 116
Venice, compared to Rhodes, 104, 358
Venus of Cnidos, epigrams on, 263
—— of Melos, the, 115
Vespasian, emperor, 494
Victor Emmanuel, 474; compared to Ptolemy I., 205
Viereck, on dramatic corporation of Teos, 412; on Roman *Sermo Graecus*, 474
Virgil, artificiality of, 240; his debts to Aratus of Soli, 245 *sq.*, 620 *sq.*; debts to Phanocles, 623 *sq.*; debts to Callimachus, 275
Virginia, U.S.A., 394
Vulso, Manlius, 500, 633

WADI HALFA, inscriptions of Greek mercenaries at, 179
Wagner, Richard, 417

War, its effect on culture and social life, 78 *sq.*
Wealth of Persia, its economic effects on Greece, 4 *sq.*, 112 *sq.*
Wellauer, editor of Apollonius Rhodius, 286
Westphal, on Aeschylus, 240
Wilamowitz, his *Antigonus von Karystos*, 63, 154, 157, 159; on Pergamum, 342
Winter, Marquis, the, 358
Wisdom of Solomon, the, 518 *sq.*, 525 *sq.*, 551
Wolsey, Cardinal, 119
Women, position of, in ancient Egypt, 186 *sq.*
Wyse, Sir T., on Sicyon, 323

XANTHIPPUS, conqueror of Regulus, 344
Xenocrates of Chalcedon, 62, 142, 155, 157, 158, 398
Xenon, member of Achaean League, 485
Xenophon, 131, 146, 287; on monarchy, 230; love-stories in, 254; on *ephebi*, 403; his *Cyropaedia*, 552
Xenophanes of Colophon, 266
Xerxes, 13, 168, 184, 190

ZAKYNTHUS (Zante), 481
Zama, battle of, 452
Zante (Zakynthus), 481
Zeller, on Greek philosophy, 140; on deportation of Greeks to Italy, 601
Zeno, 62, 134; his school of philosophy, 140, 143, 148 *sq.*, 234, 397, 400
—— historian, of Rhodes, 103; his inaccuracy, 566 *sq.*
Zenodotus, Homeric critic, 281, 544; tutor of second Ptolemy, 215
Zethus, 362
Zeus, 14, 94, 289, 470, 564
—— Hades, 201
Ziaëlas of Bithynia, 371 *sq.*, 378
Ziboetes of Bithynia, 372, 379
Zoilus, 281
Zola, M., his reception in England, 133
Zoological Gardens at Alexandria, 217
Ζῦθος, an Egyptian drink, 187

THE END

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*

00098049

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh
FOUNDATION

An Initiative by
HDFC
WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 28 December, 2018